

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No.275 of 2020

- Dinesh Kumar Manikpuri S/o Shri Sadanand Manikpuri Aged About 32 Years R/o Village- Kotmare, Police Station And Tahsil- Kartala, District- Korba, Chhattisgarh., District : Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through- S.H.O. Police Station Torwa, District- Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

--- Respondent

Shri Ravindra Sharma, counsel for applicant.
Shri Rahul Jha, Govt. Advocate for State.

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Justice Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

Order On Board

01/07/2020

Heard.

2. The applicant has preferred this application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C., apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.14/2020, registered at Police Station–Torwa, District Bilaspur for alleged commission of offence under Section-420 & 120-B of IPC.

3. Case of the prosecution is that the co-accused Vijay Malsukar introduced the complainants-Hemant Patel and his friend Shani Prajapati to Mr. Vijendra Singh, co-accused, who is working as Data Entry Operator in Civil Court, Bilaigarh. Vijendra Singh assured the complainants Hemant Patel and his friend Shani Prajapati to get job in the Railway Services and demand was made. According to the complainants, huge amount was parted with by the complainants to the extent of Rs.9,50,000/- and that amount was deposited in the account of another co-accused-Ravindra Mahto. Allegation against the present applicant is that when the complainants were called at Patna, they met with Vijendra Singh and Ravindra Mahto and Ravindra Mahto, in turn introduced

the complainants to the present applicant as one of the associate of the co-accused for getting job.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the allegation against the present applicant, as far as FIR is concerned, are very vague and not definite. He submits that even according to the complainants, no money was given by the complainants to the present applicant. It is further submitted that the applicant is a resident of state of Chhattisgarh and therefore, it is wholly improbable that he was the concerned person, who was introduced to complainants by the co-accused Ravindra Mahto.

5. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposed the prayer for grant of bail by submitting that the applicant has filed this bail application without inviting any order on merits of the case from the Court below. On merits, it is submitted that as per the FIR, the present applicant, Vijendra Singh, Ravindra Mahto and Vijay Malsukar are involved in the act of cheating.

6. Parties were introduced by Vijay Malsukar to Vijendra Singh. Vijendra Singh asked for money on the assurance of arranging employment in Railway Services and Rs.8,50,000/- was transferred in the account of Ravindra Mahto and Ravindra Mahto said to have introduced complainants to the present applicant. Therefore, in my considered opinion, it is not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the applicant.

7. In the result, the bail application (MCRCA No.275 of 2020) is rejected.

SD/-
(Manindra Mohan Shrivastava)
Judge