

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 1616 of 2020**

Surendra Patre S/o Indra Lal Patre Aged About 33 Years R/o Village
Piparmati, Tahsil Kota, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District :
Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Station House Officer, Police Station
Kota, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh., District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For the Applicant	:	Shri Rajeev Kumar Dubey, Advocate
For the State	:	Shri Dinesh Tiwari, Dy. Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sharad Kumar Gupta

Order On Board

19/06/2020

1. This is sixth bail application under Section 439 of the CrPC preferred by the applicant. Earlier his first bail application was rejected by this Court vide order dated 30/01/2019 passed in MCRC No. 106/2019 considering *prima facie* case against him. His second bail application was also rejected by this Court vide order dated 12/07/2019 passed in MCRC No. 4099/2019 considering *prima facie* case against him. His third bail application regarding temporary bail was allowed by this Court vide order dated 13/09/2019 passed in MCRC No. 5159/2019. His fourth bail application was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 08/11/2019 passed in MCRC No. 5159/2019 giving a direction to the trial Court to expedite the trial and dispose of the case as soon as possible preferably within three months from the date of receipt of copy of that order. His fifth bail application and temporary bail application were dismissed as withdrawn on 27/02/2020 by this Court passed in MCRC No.1413/2020.
2. Perused the case diary provided by counsel for the State in connection with the Crime No.579/2018 registered at Police Station Kota, District Bilaspur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 450, 506 and 376 of IPC.
3. Counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant is in jail since 2018, number of the prosecution witnesses have been examined. The case

is of acquittal. Due to corona virus, there is no possibility of early conclusion of trial. Hence applicant may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, counsel for the State opposes the bail application.
5. The aforesaid circumstances are not sufficient to release the applicant on bail in sixth round of litigation. Consequently sixth bail application of the applicant is rejected.
6. A brief report be called from the trial Court as to whether he had applied for extension of time for concluding the trial. If so, then he is under further obligation to submit the progress report from the date of receipt of certified copy of that order till date. This matter would be dealt in future in administrative side.

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
Judge

Kamde