

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 260 of 2020

1. Diwakar Prem Parwat Rathore S/o Shri Firtu Ram Rathore, Aged About 31 Years R/o Village Jharna, Police Station - Nagarda, District Janjgir - Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Nagarda, District - Janjgir - Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

MCRCA No. 183 of 2020

1. Sahertin Bai, W/o Firtu Ram Rathore Aged About 65 Years
2. Firtu Ram Rathore S/o Late Bansi Dhar Rathore Aged About 70 Years

Applicants No. 1 And 2 Are Caste Teli, Resident Of Village Jharna, Tahsil Champa, Police Station Nagrada, District - Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

3. Yashwant Kumar Rathore S/o Natthu Ram Rathore Aged About 45 Years Caste Teli, Resident Of Village Nandoorkala, Police Station And Tahsil Sakti, District - Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicants

Versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Nagrada, District Janjgir- Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	Mr. U.K.S. Chandel, Advocate
For Respondent /State	Mr. Sudeep Agrawal, Dy. Adv. General
For Objector	Mr. Ishwar Jaiswal, Advocate

Proceedings through Video Conferencing

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra

Order On Board

24/6/2020

1. Since both the applications arising out of same crime number i.e. Cr. No.4/2020 they are being considered and decided by this common order.
2. The applicants have preferred these applications for grant of anticipatory bail, as they apprehend their arrest in connection with Crime No.4/2020 registered at Police Station Nagraha, District Janjgir-Champa, for offence punishable under Section 498-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Applicant - Diwakar Prem Parwat Rathore was married with the complainant on 27-1-2019. The husband and other applicants, who happened to be the mother-in-law, father-in-law and maternal uncle, have allegedly demanded Rs.5.00 lacs cash and four wheeler.
4. Learned State Counsel and learned counsel appearing for the objector would oppose the prayer for grant of bail.
5. The bail rejection order passed by the Sessions Court reflects that counseling was conducted in which the complainant threatened that the applicants would be sent to jail.
6. Considering the entire facts situation of the case, this Court is inclined to release the applicants on anticipatory bail.
7. Accordingly, both the applications are allowed and it is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicants, they shall be released on anticipatory bail on each of them executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the arresting officer with the following conditions:-

- (a) they shall make themselves available for interrogation by a police officer as and when required;
- (b) they 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 from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.

Sd/-
(Prashant Kumar Mishra)
Judge

Gowri