

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 9961 of 2018

1. Sampat Giri S/o Shivcharan Aged About 60 Years R/o Caste Vaishanav R/o Village Jhalri Chowki Khudiya Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.
2. Vishnu Giri S/o Sampat Giri Aged About 27 Years R/o Caste Vaishanav R/o Village Jhalri Chowki Khudiya Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.
3. Kishnu Giri S/o Sampat Giri Aged About 24 Years R/o Caste Vaishanav R/o Village Jhalri Chowki Khudiya Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.
4. Deepak Giri S/o Sampat Giri Aged About 22 Years R/o Caste Vaishanav R/o Village Jhalri Chowki Khudiya Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicants

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Ajak Police Station Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicants : Mr. Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate.
For Respondent/State : Mr. Bhaskar Payashi, Panel Lawyer.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board

22/01/2019

1. The applicants have preferred this first bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail as they are arrested in connection with crime No. 4/2018, registered at Police Station – Lormi, District- Mungeli (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 294, 323, 336, 325 & 34 of the IPC and Section 3 (1) (a) of the SC/ST (PA) Act.
2. As per prosecution story, on 01.01.2018 allegedly all the applicants due to some dispute, abused the complainant Raju Maravi and his wife Teeja Bai by the name of their caste and they have also assaulted

them, due to which complainant and his wife sustained injuries on the various parts of their body. Thereafter, the matter was reported. On the basis of said report, offence has been registered against the present applicants. The applicants are in custody since 26.11.2018.

3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. All the offence with relates to IPC are inailable nature. He further submits that the applicants are in custody since 26.11.2018 and trial will take some time. Therefore, the applicants may be released on bail.
4. Per contra, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the bail application.
5. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the case diary with due care.
6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the evidence collected by the prosecution and further considering the fact that the applicants are in custody since 26.11.2018 and trial will likely to take some time, without further commenting on merits of the case, I am inclined to release the applicants on bail.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.
8. It is directed that the applicants shall be released on bail on each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one solvent surety for the like amount to the satisfaction of the Trial Court for their appearance before the said Court as and when directed.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge