

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR
MCRCA No. 965 of 2020

Shubham Sonkar S/o Bhaiyya Lal Sonkar Aged About 23 Years R/o Camp-1,
Near Gausiya Masjid, 58/d, Power House Bhilai, Civil And Revenue, District-
Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The District Magistrate Durg, Civil And Revenue
District- Durg, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicant	: Mr. Parasmani Shrivastava, Advocate.
For Respondent/State	: Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, G.A.
For Objector	: Mr. Rakesh Kumar Thakur, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order On Board

23/09/2020

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 he is apprehending his arrest in connection with crime no. 99/2020, registered at Police Station Chhawani, Distt. Durg (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 307 & 34 of the IPC.
3. In this case there are total three accused persons. According to the case of prosecution, on 20.02.2020, at about 2 AM, the applicant along with other co-accused person namely Deepak and Raja went near Sharma Furniture thereafter they started quarrel with complainant namely Prashant Mishra and during that time the applicant and other co-accused Raja caught hands of the complainant and co-accused Dipak assaulted him with the help of knife due to that the complainant sustained injuries on his chest, neck and hands, thereafter, the matter was report by the complainant/victim. On the basis of said complaint, offence has been registered against the applicant.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant submits that the

applicant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that main allegations have been levelled against other co-accused persons namely Dipak and Raja and Raja has already granted benefit of regular bail by this Court. Hence, it is prayed that the applicant may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State and objector opposes the bail application.
6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, evidence collected by the prosecution, arguments advanced by both the counsel appearing for the parties, allegations made against the applicant and role played by him in the crime in question. Without further commenting on other merits of the case, in my considered opinion, it is not a fit case for grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is rejected.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge