

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1734 of 2018

- Bhairon Singh Thakur, aged about 17 years (minor) through the Legal guardian father Shri Narendra Singh Thakur, aged about 34 years, S/o Shri Jagannath Singh, R/o Vinoba Nagar, Police Station Tarbahar Tahsil and District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Lines, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Non-applicant

MCRCA No. 200 of 2019

- Avijeet Shrivastav @ Avi, S/o Shri Shankarlal Shrivastava, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Ward No.44, Gali No.1, Jabdapara, Police Station Sarkanda, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Civil Lines, Civil and Revenue District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant – Mr. Ashish Shrivastava, Advocate (in MCRCA No.1734/2018),
Mr. Sunil Verma, Advocate (in MCRCA No.200/2019).
For Non-applicant/State – Ms. Madhunisha Singh, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant

Order on Board

05-02-2019

1. It is submitted by learned counsel for the applicants in both the applications are apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.833/2018, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, Bilaspur, C.G. for the offence punishable under Section 307, 323, 34 of the IPC. Therefore, these applications have been filed for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the State/non-applicant opposes the applications and submits that there is no crime number registered in Police Station - Civil Lines Bilaspur against the applicants in both the applications and further the

police has completed the investigation and filed the charge sheet in which these applicants are not accused persons, therefore, there is no apprehension. Hence, there applications may be rejected as not maintainable.

3. It is again submitted by learned counsel for the applicants in both the applications that the applicants have been summoned by the police, therefore, they have apprehension of being arrested in this case, hence, the relief be granted.

4. On perusal of the diary statement of the witnesses, it appears that there is no statement of any witness against these applicants. Hence, on this basis it appears that the applications filed by both the applicants are not maintainable, which are rejected accordingly.

Sd/-
(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)
Judge