

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 1730 of 2019

Reena Verma D/o Late Kalika Prasad Verma Aged About 49 Years
R/o House No. J /73, Janta Quarter, Choubey Colony, Raipur, Police
Station Purani Basti, District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Purani Basti Raipur,
District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Vineet Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Shubham Verma, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board

20/12/2019

1. The applicant has filed this bail application for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. as she is apprehending her arrest in connection with crime no. 282/2019, registered at Police Station: Purani Basti Raipur, District- Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 384, 507 of IPC and 64 (A) of Information Technology Act, 2000.
2. As per the prosecution story, on 05.08.2019 complainant namely Raja Pansari made a written complaint alleging therein that in the year 2000-01, the Applicant was the neighbour of the complainant therefore friendship developed between them but after the lapse of two years, the Applicant moved to another locality. Recently in the year 2008-09, the complainant met with the Applicant in one shop at

Sadar Bazar where they have exchanged their mobile number and again friendship between them developed. Allegedly in the year 2018-19 the Applicant pressurized the complainant to make love relationship but when the complainant refused to do so the Applicant started sending filthy messages to the complainant in his mobile phone and threatened that she will put the complainant behind the bar after committing suicide. On the basis of said, offence has been registered.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant is falsely implicated in the present case due to some dispute between the Applicant and the complainant but now both of them have settled their matter amicably and complainant doesn't want to take any action against the Applicant, he has also no any objection to grant anticipatory bail to the Applicant therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the Applicant.
4. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of State opposes the bail application.
5. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, arguments advanced by counsel for the parties and further considering the fact that complainant is present today and he had admitted the fact that they have settled their matter and he has no objection in granting bail to the Applicant, without further commenting on other merits of the case, in my considered opinion, it is a fit case for grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed.
8. It is directed that in the event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the officer arresting him and he shall abide by all the following terms and conditions:-

- I. That the accused/applicant shall made herself available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required;
- II. The accused/applicant 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/applicant shall not act, in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- IV. The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date given to him by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-

(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge