

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 1467 of 2019**

- Parasram Dewangen S/o Late Shri Mannu Lal Dewangan Aged About 31 Years R/o Mahamaya Chowk, Pallari, P. S. Pallari, District Baloda Bazaar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through P. S. Pallari, District Baloda Bazaar-Bhatapara Chhattisgarh, District : Balodabazar-Bhathapara, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Shri Ashutosh Trivedi, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	:	Ms. Reena Singh,P.L.

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey
Order on Board

12/09/2019

1. Heard on admission.
2. Admit.
3. This is the first application filed by the applicant under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail, who is apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.245/2019, registered at Police Station Pallari, District Baloda Bazar-Bhatapara(CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 498A, 34 of the IPC.
4. Case of the prosecution is that the complainant- Swati Dewangan lodged a report in the Police Station stating that the applicant(her husband) and his family members were ill treating her on account of small issues. The applicant used to consume liquor and beating her. He snatched her mobile phone. On 24.3.2019 the applicant poured hot oil of the pan on

her, which burnt her hand and he ousted her from the house in burnt condition.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. On account of small disputes, the complainant has lodged a report against the applicant. He submits that the complainant has also implicated the family members of the applicants, who have already been enlarged on anticipatory bail by the court below. He prays that the applicant may also be released on anticipatory bail.
6. On the other hand, counsel for the State opposes the application for anticipatory bail.
7. I have heard learned counsel the parties and perused the case-diary.
8. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly considering that the main allegations are against the applicant, who is husband of the complainant, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant. Accordingly, the application filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is rejected.
9. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/

(Rajani Dubey)
JUDGE