

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 2290 of 2019**

- Tekram @ Suraj Sahu S/o Shri Shiv Kumar Sahu, Aged About 22 Years R/o Village Sargaon Ward No. 5, Outpost, P. S. Sargaon, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Sargaon, District Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri Deepak Jain, Advocate.
For Objector	: Shri Atul Kumar Kesharwani, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Shri V.K. Agrawal, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board**25/04/2019**

1. The Applicant has preferred this first bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail as he is arrested in connection with crime No. 12/2019, registered at Police Station – Sargaon, District - Mungeli, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 354(D), 354, 294, 506 of IPC.
2. As per the prosecution story, prosecutrix is a girl aged about 18 years. On 13.01.2019 prosecutrix lodged a report in police station wherein it has been stated that earlier she had lodged a report against the Applicant on 09.09.2018 regarding eve-teasing. On the basis of the said report, Applicant was arrested. After granting bail on the said case, Applicant again chased her also abused her. On 08.01.2019 also, Applicant entered into the college ground of the prosecutrix and hold her hand and also used criminal force against her. On the basis of the said, offence has been registered against the Applicant. He has been arrested on 01.03.2019.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Applicant submits that there was previous enmity between Applicant and family of the prosecutrix. Therefore, Applicant has been falsely implicated in the case. Earlier also, Applicant has been falsely implicated by the prosecutrix. It is further alleged that after grant of bail, Applicant has already moved an application before the concerned police station that he could be apprehended by falsely implicating him. Applicant is in custody since 01.03.2019 and trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, he may be released on bail.
4. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State and Counsel for the Objector oppose the bail application.
5. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the case diary.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the evidence collected by the prosecution and further considering the fact that the Applicant is in custody since 01.03.2019 and trial is likely to take some time, without further commenting on merits of the case, I am inclined to release him on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.
8. It is directed that the Applicant shall be released on bail on executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one solvent surety for the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court for his appearance before the said Court as and when directed.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge