

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 9401 of 2018**

Mahendra Singh Rajput, S/o Late Topsingh Rajput, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Durga Chauk, Shankar Nagar, Thana- Mohan Nagar, District- Durg (C.G.) **---- Applicant**

Versus

The State of Chhattisgarh, Through Police Station- Mohan Nagar, District- Durg (C.G.) **---- Respondent**

For Applicant : Mr. Samir Singh, Advocate

For State : Mr. Raghvendra Verma, Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Ram Prasanna Sharma**Order On Board****07/02/2019**

1. This is second bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the applicant, who has been arrested on 09.04.2017 in connection with Crime No. 122/2017 (Criminal Case No. 10/2017) registered at Police Station- Mohan Nagar, District- Durg (C.G.), for offence punishable under Sections 420, 409/34 of IPC, 1860 & Sections 3, 4 & 5 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act, 1978.
2. As per case of the prosecution, the complainant Sunil Kumar Jain lodged a written complaint that he invested Rs. 1,000/- per month to four years in Arogya Dhan Versha Developers & Allied Limited for higher returns, but the amount has not been returned and the office has been closed.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the crime in

question. The trial will take sufficient time, therefore, the applicant may be enlarged on bail.

4. On the contrary, learned State counsel opposes the application for grant of bail and submits that the applicant being Manager of one Arogya Dhan Versha Developers & Allied Limited assured higher return in deposit and on his assurance, the persons namely Sunil Kumar Jain (Rs. 92,000/-), Ishwari Prasad (Rs. 70,00,000/-), Om Prakash (Rs. 18,93,000/-), Krishna (Rs. 5,00,000/-), Surendra Kumar (Rs. 4,00,000/-), Baisakhu (Rs. 2,16,000/-), Pushabai (Rs. 17,600/-), Nand Kumar Sahu (Rs. 31,21,968/-) & Shobharam Sahu (Rs. 15,50,000/-) deposited total Rs. 1,47,90,568/-, but no amount was returned and ultimately office was closed.
5. Looking to the fact that the huge amount has been deposited deceiving a number of persons and further looking to the fact that the office has been closed and no remedy is available to the depositors, it is not a fit case to grant bail in favour of the applicant. I am not inclined to grant regular bail in favour of the applicant.
6. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is rejected. However, the trial court is directed to expedite the trial.

Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Ram Prasanna Sharma)
Judge