

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.Cr.C. No. 4337 of 2018**

Pranjal Pandey S/o Shri Vijay Pandey Aged About 30 Years R/o- Brishpati Bazar, Chantapara, Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- Police Station- Sarkanda Bilaspur, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For the Applicant : Shri Ravish Verma, Advocate.
For the Respondent/State : Shri Anupam Dubey, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant**ORDER****18.07.2018**

Heard.

1. This is the first bail application filed under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has been arrested in connection with Crime No.325 of 2018, registered at Police Station – Sarkanda, Bilaspur, District – Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is in jail since 13.5.2018 and has been falsely implicated in this case. No case is made out against the applicant on the basis of the material placed before the Court by the prosecution. The application for bail was filed on behalf of Mohan Banjare on 2.1.2017 and the applicant was not employed in the

Bank at that time and he joined his duties on 4.1.2018. When this applicant himself came to know about the fraud committed in this case, he himself made a complaint to the bank and the annexures have been filed in this respect. Hence, it is prayed that the applicant be enlarged on bail.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application and the submissions made in this respect. It is submitted that although the application for grant of loan was filed earlier but the loan was sanctioned after the applicant joined as Public Relation Officer and it was his duty to verify the details of the loan application and report and on that basis the loan was sanctioned later on, on 20.1.2018 in connivance with other co-accused persons. The applicant alongwith co-accused persons are the beneficiaries of the said loan. Hence, he is not entitled for grant of regular bail.

4. Heard counsel for both the parties and perused the case diary.

5. Complainant – Mohan Banjare filed a complaint making allegation that the loan of about Rs.16,00,000/- has been obtained by some persons impersonating as the complainant in a fraudulent manner. In the investigation, it has been found that the applicant has played role in the commission of offence. Hence, this case.

6. Considered the entire material present in the case-diary and the trial of the case is likely to take sometime for its conclusion, I am of the considered view that no purpose would be served if the applicant is kept in detention for the whole period of trial. Hence, this application deserves to be allowed.

7. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is allowed.

8. It is directed that applicant shall be released on bail on his furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court, for his appearance as and when directed. In case any default is committed by the applicant/s in appearing before the concerned trial Court, this order granting bail shall stand cancelled automatically.

Sd/-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge