

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1537 of 2019

1. Rajesh Sharma S/o Ram Singh, aged about 50 years, Occupation Wager,
2. Smt. Meena Sharma W/o Rajesh Sharma, aged about 45 years, Occupation- House Wife,
3. Saurabh Sharma S/o Rajesh Sharma, aged about 20 years, Occupation- Student,

All are R/o Chandrapur Actual R/o Village Sapose, P.S. Tahsil Dabhra Distt. Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

---- Applicant

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through SHO P.S. City Kotwali, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Ishwar Jaiswal, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Sushil Sahu, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

Order on Board

20/12/2019

1. The Applicant has filed this application for grant of anticipatory bail as he is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No. 602/2019 registered at police station City Kotwali, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 498 (A)/34 of the IPC.
2. As per prosecution story, Applicant Nos. 1 & 2 are father-in-law and mother-in-law of the Complainant, respectively. Applicant No. 3 is brother-in-law of the Complainant. The marriage between the Complainant and Gaurav Sharma was solemnized on 17/01/2019. It is alleged that after the marriage, the Applicants had demanded Rs. 3 Lakhs from the complainant to construct house. It is further alleged that Gaurav, husband of the Complainant is having illicit relation with other women, due to that he committed Marpeet with the Applicant.

On these reasons, a report has been made by the Complainant on 11/08/2019.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Applicant submits that the Applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case. Only general allegations has been made against all the Applicants. He further submits that from 18/06/2019, the Complainant is residing separately and FIR has been lodged after two months i.e. on 11/08/2019. Therefore, 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 that the Applicants are father-in-law, brother-in-law and mother-in-law of the Complainant and there are only general allegations against them, without further commenting on other merits of the case, I am inclined to grant the benefit of anticipatory bail in favour of the Applicants.
7. Accordingly, this bail application is allowed.
8. It is directed that in the event of arrest, the Applicants shall be released on bail on each of them furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the officer arresting them and they shall abide by all the following terms and conditions:
 - i. That, the accused/Applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned

Investigating Officer as and when required;

- ii. The accused/Applicants shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii. The accused/Applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- iv. The Applicants shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

9. Certified copy, as per rules.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge

Shubham