

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 999 of 2019**

- Banjaram Michcha, S/o Michcha Suklu, aged about 24 years, R/o Village – Borje, P.S.- Toyenar, Tahsil & District – Bijapur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through District Magistrate, Bijapur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri P.R. Patankar, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Shri Amit Singh, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board

01/03/2019

1. The Applicant has preferred this second bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail as he is arrested in connection with crime No. 02/2017, registered at Police Station – Toyenar, District - Bijapur, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 363, 370 of the Indian Penal Code.
2. First bail application was earlier dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to file afresh after examination of some material witnesses vide order dated 22.10.2018 passed in MCRC No. 5502 of 2018.
3. As per the prosecution story, the present Applicant gave allurements to the victim girls that he will give large amount of money and took them to Delhi and sold them for Rs. 20,000/- each at an agency and thereafter they were sent to Ludhiana for work from where one Sunita Vacham absconded and returned to her home and also one victim girl Sushila Kudiya came to Delhi. On the basis of the said background, after filing of the FIR, offence has been registered. The Applicant has been taken into custody on 19.05.2017.

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Applicant submits that though the first bail application of the Applicant was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 22.10.2018 passed in MCRC No. 5502/2018, with liberty to file afresh after examination of some material witnesses but after passing of the said order, till date no other witnesses have been examined. He also submits that the Applicant is in custody since 19.05.2017 and trial is likely to take some time, thus, looking to the detention period of the Applicant, he prays for releasing the Applicant on bail.
5. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the bail application.
6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions made by the parties, material available on records and further considering the fact that after granting liberty, no other witnesses have been examined, I am not inclined to release the Applicant on bail.
8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge