

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 484 of 2017

- S. V. V. R. Shashtri S/o S. N. Vishwanath, Aged About 46 Years R/o Qtr. No. 9/ A, Street -12, Sector -7, Bhilai, Tahsil Civil And Revenue District Durg Chhattisgarh , Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Sector -6, Kotwali, Bhilai, Civil And Revenue District Durg Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. Punit Ruparel, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr. Ashok Swarnkar, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant
Order On Board

24/01/2018

1. The applicant has preferred this bail application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.38/2017 registered at Police Station- Sector-6, Bhilai, District – Durg(C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 420 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC').
2. Learned counsel for applicant submits that applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. The incident reported in the FIR is of the year 2006 and written complaint was lodged with a delay of 10 years on 1.9.2016. After making an enquiry on the complaint, FIR has been lodged on 19th January, 2017. The allegations made against this applicant are totally baseless and not supported with any

document, thus, no case is made out against him. Hence, it is prayed that he may be granted anticipatory bail.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the bail application and the submissions. It is submitted that there is clear allegation in the statement made by the complainant in his written complaint and in the statement before the police that applicant and other co-accused persons had on various occasions have induced the complainant to pay Rs.25 lakhs on pretext that they are arranging to get a Gas Agency for him. Subsequently, the co-accused persons went in hiding and could not be contacted, because of which the FIR has been lodged. Hence, applicant is not entitled for grant of bail.
4. Heard both the parties and perused the case diary.
5. The case against the applicant has been briefly discussed hereinabove, as there are direct allegations against the applicant in the statement given by the complainant and other witnesses. I am of this opinion, that this is not a fit case where applicant should be enlarged on anticipatory bail.
6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

Sd/-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge