

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****CRA No.321 of 2019**

- Naresh Telami S/o Bodu @ Buddu Aged About 31 Years R/o Village- Gumiyapal, Police Station- Kirandul, District- Dantewada, Chhattisgarh., District : Dantewada, Chhattisgarh

**---- Appellant****Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station- Kirandul, District- Dantewada, Chhattisgarh., District : Dantewada, Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondent**


---

|                      |   |                                  |
|----------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| For Appellant        | : | Shri Vikas Shrivastava, Advocate |
| For Respondent/State | : | Shri KK Singh, GA                |

---

**D.B.: Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava**  
**Hon'ble Smt. Justice Vimla Singh Kapoor**

**Order on Board****Per Manindra Mohan Shrivastava, J.****12/04/2019**

1. This appeal is directed against the impugned order dated 29-12-2018 passed by the learned Special Judge, N.I.A. Act/Sah. Offences, Jagdalpur, District Bastar in Special Case No.92/2018, rejecting bail application of the appellant in connection with alleged involvement in commission of offence under Section 147, 148, 149, 341, 435, 395, 120(b) of IPC, Section 3 of V. P. Adhiniyam Section 25 of the Arms Act, Section 8(1)(3)(5) of Chhattisgarh Vishesh Jan Suraksha Adhiniyam and Section 13(1)(a)(b), 23(1), 38(2) & 39(2) of Unlawful Activity (Prevention) Act.

2. The appellant has been involved in this case on the allegation of setting ablaze of vehicles and other equipments used in the construction activities, which are said to be part and parcel of naxalite operation. Learned trial Court

considered the bail application of the appellant and rejected the same, against which, the present appeal has been filed.

3. Learned counsel for the appellant would argue that the involvement of the appellant in the aforesaid case is false and fabricated and only based on his name appearing in the memorandum statements. It is argued that no identification has been done and as the witnesses have not specifically stated regarding name of the present appellant, he is entitled to grant of bail on appropriate conditions.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel supports the impugned order of rejection of bail by submitting that the appellant is involved in the commission of grave offence as also he is involved in the naxalite activity of setting ablaze the vehicles and extending threat. He would submit that many witnesses, who have seen the incident, are yet to be examined.

5. We have heard learned counsel for the parties.

6. Taking into consideration the allegation of grave in nature against the present appellant and there are witnesses, who have seen the incident, are yet to be examined and that in the event of grant of bail to the appellant, there is a possibility of fleeing away from justice as also hamper the progress of trial, we are not inclined to interfere with the impugned order of rejection of grant of bail.

7. Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed. However, after examination of so-called witnesses, who are said to have seen the incident, it would be open for the appellant to approach the trial Court again.

SD/-  
**(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)**  
**Judge**

SD/-  
**(Vimla Singh Kapoor)**  
**Judge**