

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CRMP No. 2240 of 2018

- Vishal Agrawal S/o Ashok Agrawal Aged About 31 Years Permanent R/o Ward No. 16 Mangal Bhawan Complex ,near Ashutosh Textile ,main Road ,raurkela ,police Station Uditnagar ,district Sundergarh , Odhisa Presently R/at House No.98 Krishna Nagar Colony ,tilda ,police Station ,nevra ,district Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer ,police Station Nevra ,district Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Petitioner: Mr. Raghvendra Pradhan, Advocate.

For Objector : Mr. Devershi Thakur, Advocate.

For State: Mrs. Madhunisha Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order on board

12/11/2018

1. Petition has been brought under Section 482 of CrPC praying for extension of time in the bail granted to the applicant in MCRC No.4899 of 2018 vide order dated 9.8.2018.
2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that after release of applicant on temporary bail, the applicant had undergone treatment and still he needs to be treated further for which it is prayed that time granted in the order dated 9.8.2018 be extended for further 3 months.

3. Learned State counsel opposes the petition and submissions made in this respect. It is submitted that the ailment from which the applicant is suffering can be treated during his detention in jail, hence, the petition be rejected.
4. Considered on the submissions and perused the documents filed along with application, the medical prescription filed show outdoor case-sheet dated from 5.11.2018 to 8.11.2018 describing the ailment from which the applicant is suffering, but no such document has been placed on record to show that the time granted to the applicant in temporary bail was utilized in the treatment by continuously attending any hospital facility or being admitted to any hospital, hence, under these circumstance it appears that the interim bail granted earlier to the applicant has not been utilized in the treatment and, further, the prescription placed on record also do not show any advice from the doctors concerned.
5. After due consideration, I do not feel inclined to allow this petition. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge