

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No.255 of 2018**

Ku. Teena Sharma, D/o Pappu Sharma, aged about 14 years, R/o Dr. Rajendra Nagar, Janta Colony, Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh, Being minor prosecutrix represented through natural guardian father namely Pappu Sharma, R/o Dr. Rajendra Nagar, Janta Colony, Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant**versus**

1. The State of Chhattisgarh through Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Deepak Bhoi (Kulshresth), aged about 23 years, S/o Raghumani Bhoi @ Vipul Kulshresth, R/o Qtr. No.46-47, Old Janta Quarter, Dr. Rajendra Nagar, Police Station Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondents

For Applicant	:	Shri Malay Kumar Bhaduri, Advocate
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri Sameer Behar, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.2	:	Shri Pragalbha Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel**Order on Board****30.4.2018**

1. With the consent of Learned Counsel appearing for the parties, the revision is heard and decided finally.
2. The revision has been preferred against the order dated 18.1.2018 passed by the 7th Additional Sessions Judge, Raipur in Case No.317 of 2016 by which the Learned Additional Sessions Judge has rejected the application filed by the prosecutrix/Applicant for cancellation of bail of the accused/Respondent No.2, Deepak Bhoi.
3. Learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant/prosecutrix submits that vide order dated 20.12.2016, Respondent No.2/accused has been enlarged on bail by the Trial Court with certain terms and conditions. He further submits that Respondent No.2/accused has

misused the liberty of bail and occasionally harassed the minor prosecutrix/Applicant by asking her to compromise the matter and not to state anything against him otherwise she will have to face consequences if any adverse order is passed against him. Against the said threatenings of the accused, she made certain complaints to the police, but no action has been taken. Thereafter, she made an application before the Trial Court for cancellation of the bail granted to Respondent No.2/accused which has been rejected vide the impugned order dated 18.1.2018 by the Trial Court in a very casual manner.

4. Learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.2/accused submits that statement of the prosecutrix/Applicant has already been recorded by the Trial Court, therefore, no question of giving her threat by the accused arises.
5. Since the prosecutrix/Applicant has already been examined by the Trial Court, now no question arises to give her threat by the accused/Respondent No.2. Therefore, the instant revision is disposed of with the aforesaid observation.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge