

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No.1227 of 2018**

- Veerbhadra S/o Shri Loknath Aged About 22 Years R/o Village Hasaud, P.S. Hasaud, Birra, Tahsil Jaijaipur, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Birra, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent

For Petitioner : Smt. Hamida Siddiqui, Advocate
 For Respondent/State : Shri Anupam Dubey, GA

Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**Order On Board****06/10/2018**

Heard.

1. The applicant has preferred this application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.60/2017, registered at Police Station–Birra, District Janjgir-Champa for alleged commission of offence under Sections 489-A, 489-B & 489-C of IPC.
2. This is the second application for grant of anticipatory bail. First bail application of the applicant was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to surrender and apply for grant of regular bail, but the applicant has not surrendered and again applied for grant of anticipatory bail.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that inhabitant applicant is a law abiding and respectable inhabitant of the area and running a

medical shop and he is being falsely implicated in this case only on the basis of memorandum of his driver Lakeshwar Yadav and some other person Purushottam with whom the applicant is nowhere concerned. It is next submitted that till date, no notice under Section 41-A of Cr.P.C. have been given to the applicant, which shows that the applicant is only being harassed by simple registering the criminal case against him.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer for grant of bail on the submission that Lakeshwar Yadav and Purushottam were apprehended by the police and on the basis of their memorandum, huge quantity of counterfeit currency was seized from his possession and they have stated in their memorandum that the applicant is the main accused, who gave fake currency notes to these persons for being circulated.

5. Taking into consideration the submission of learned counsel for the parties, particularly taking into consideration the aforesaid allegations against the applicant, in my considered opinion, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out.

6. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

SD/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge