

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1346 of 2019

Puniya Bai, aged about 54 years W/o Kashi Ram Verma R/o Village Sukhatal,
Post Sarangpur Kala, Thana- Kawardha, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, through District Magistrate/Police Station Kabirdham,
District Kabirdham (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Rajat Agrawal, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Anand Verma, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

Order on Board

05/11/2019

1. The Applicant has filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 350/2019 registered at police station Kawardha, District kabirdham (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 409, 467, 468, 469 and 120-B/34 of the IPC.
2. In this case there are two accused persons. At the relevant time, the Applicant was the Sarpanch of Village Shukhtaal. In the year 2015, Rs. 69 lakhs were allotted to Gram Panchayat Sukhlal for construction of toilets. The allegation against her is that forged documents of 86 beneficiaries have been prepared for again sullyng material to them and the allotted fund was misused. Further, some people of other villages have been shown as the resident of Village Shukhtaal and on account of construction of toilet on their names, the fund has been embezzled. Apart from this, forged entries has been made in the

master-roll and the names of other people have been misused. Even the entries of two people, who had already died, have been entered in the said master-roll, and thereby committed the said offence.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Applicant submits that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. The Applicant being Sarpanch of the village Shukhtaal had only signed the documents. It is further alleged that in the year 2017 the same allegation has been made and after inquiry, it has been held in the inquiry report that the allegations are vague and baseless. The Applicant is a lady and prima-facie no offence is made out against her. He prays that the Applicant may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.
4. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposed the bail application.
5. I have heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submission put forth by the counsel for the parties, particularly considering the nature of allegation leveled against the Applicant and the evidence collected by the Prosecution, I am not inclined to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail in favour of the Applicant.
7. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

Sd/-

(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge