

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Acquittal Appeal No.58 of 2010**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer,
Dallirajahara Distt. Durg (CG)

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. Gopal Rao Ransingh, S/o. Dashrath Rao Ranshing, aged about 49 years, Chief Municipal Officer, Dallirajahara District Durg (CG) R/o. Civil Lines, Balod Distt. Durg (CG)
2. Arvind Nath Yogi, S/o. Buddheshwar Nath Yogi, aged about 39 years, Clerk in Municipal Council Dallirajahara Distt. Durg (CG) R/o. Village Chandeni Bhata, near Bus Stand, Dallirajahara, Distt. Durg (CG)

---- Respondents

For the Appellant/State : Shri AN Bhakta, Dy. Advocate General

For the Respondents : None

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ram Prasanna Sharma**Judgment On Board****29.3.2019.**

1. This appeal is directed against judgment of acquittal dated 05.01.2005 passed by First Additional Sessions Judge/Special Judge under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, (for short 'the Act 1988) Durg (CG) in Special Case No.02/2002 wherein the said Court acquitted the respondents for the charges under Section 7 and 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Act, 1988.

2. The respondents have been charge sheeted for demanding/taking illegal gratification of Rs.2,40,000/- from Krishna Kumar Chandrakar, Arjun Pawar, Nandkishore Choudhary, Radhe Shyam Sharma, Elan Chandrakar, Abdul Kalim, Mansingh, Dashrath and others, daily wages workers of

Municipal Corporation of Dillirajhara for their regularization on or before 09.3.1988.

3. Ghanshyam Sharma (PW-7), Elan Lal Chandrakar (PW-8), Champalal Tekam (PW-9), Arjun Singh Pawar (PW-10), Budhiman Singh (PW-11), KD Chandrakar (PW-12) and Sewaram Nirmalkar (PW-18) have been examined before the trial Court as complainants but no one stated against any of the respondents that they demanded/accepted any sum from them regarding their regularization. Other witnesses deposed regarding enquiry in the matter after receiving complaint, but from their version there is nothing to incriminate any of the respondents. The trial Court elaborately discussed the entire evidence and recorded finding of acquittal. After reassessing the entire evidence, this Court has no reason to substitute a contrary finding. It is not a case where the finding of the trial Court can be reversed.

4. Accordingly, the appeal is liable to be and is hereby dismissed.

Sd/-
(Ram Prasanna Sharma)
JUDGE