

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 6805 of 2019**

- Suraj Prasad Sharma S/o Late Devi Prasad Sharma, Aged About 38 Years R/o Amaruva, Police Station - Saragaon, District - Janjgir - Champa Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant**Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Kukdur, District – Kabirdham, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Shri Govind Ram Miri and Shri Basant Kaiwartya, Advocates.
For Respondent/State	: Shri Anand Verma, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board**05/11/2019**

1. The Applicant has preferred this second bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. in connection with Crime No. 93/2017 registered at Police Station Kukdur, District – Kabirdham, (C.G.). for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 of Indian Penal Code.
2. First bail application of the Applicant was earlier dismissed on merits vide order dated 19.06.2018 passed in MCRC No. 2111/2018.
3. As per the prosecution story, Complainant Ravishankar Shrivastava is working as Salesman in Adivasi Seva Sahakari Samiti, Kukdur. In the year 2013, co-accused Narendra Kumar met with the Complainant and told him that he know such person who can promote him in Jila Sahkari Central Bank, Bilaspur. Later on, Narendra Kumar and present Applicant Suraj Prasad Sharma met with the Complainant and offered him for appointment of clerk post by demanding Rs. 5 lakhs. It is alleged that both of them obtained Rs. 7.5 lakhs from the

Complainant and thereafter, present Applicant gave appointment letter of Jila Sahakari Central Bank, Bilaspur Branch, Seepat, which was forged. On the basis of the said complaint, offence has been registered.

4. Learned Counsel Shri Govind Ram Miri appearing for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that, main accused of the case i.e. Narendra Kumar has already been granted bail and Complainant of the case has already been examined before the trial Court. Present Applicant is in custody since 28.10.2017 and trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, he may be released on bail.
5. Learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application.
6. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available with due care.
7. Taking into consideration the submissions put-forth on behalf of the parties, considering the fact and circumstances of the case and further considering the fact that earlier, first bail application of the Applicant has been dismissed on merits and there is no any new ground raised by learned Counsel for grant of bail to the Applicant, without further commenting on other merits of the case, I am not inclined to release the Applicant on bail.
8. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected. However, trial Court is directed to expedite the matter and decide the same as early as possible probably within one year from today.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge