

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 688 of 2020

Roma Bhoumik W/o Vishwajeet Bhoumik, Aged About 45 Years R/o Rama Valley, Raipur Road, District - Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Officer In - Charge, State Economic Offence Investigation Bureau, Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Ishan Verma, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Ms. Hamida Siddiqui, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board

18.08.2020

1. The matter is heard through Video Conferencing.
2. The applicant has filed this bail application for grant of anticipatory bail under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. as she is apprehending her arrest in connection with Crime No. 04/2020, registered at Police Station: State Economic Offence Investigation Bureau, Branch: Raipur, District: Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 420, 467, 468 & 471 of IPC.
3. According to the case of prosecution, the present Applicant along with her husband namely Vishwajeet Bhoumik prepared forged documents, property papers and submitted them before the bank to keep property as security with malafide intention and received benefit of Rupees Five Crore Four Lakh. Allegations against the present Applicant is that she represented herself as the proprietor of one M/S Udaan IT and mortgaged the property of Ms. Anita Narang without her consent. It is further alleged that she along with the bank officials prepared forged documents and put forged signature of Anita Narang and obtained loan of Rupees Five Crore Four Lakh from the bank. On the basis of said, offence has been registered.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the applicant is falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that main allegations are against the husband of the present Applicant, the husband of the present Applicant misguided the Applicant and he had established the firm namely M/S Udaan IT and taken the forged sign in the blank papers. Virtually, he has committed cheating and in the alleged crime there is no role of the Applicant. Learned counsel further submits that there is no direct allegations against the present Applicant, therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the Applicant.
5. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of State opposes the bail application.
6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, arguments advanced by the counsel for the parties and on perusal of contents of the FIR and material collected by the prosecution, I find there is sufficient material available against the present Applicant, therefore, looking to the role played by the present Applicant and nature of offence and evidence collected by the prosecution, I am not inclined to grant benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicant.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge