

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPURMCRCA No. 1104 of 2020

- Balram Singh Painkra S/o Late Sukhman Singh Painkra, Aged About 57 Years Posted As Manager, Punjab National Bank Branch Saardha, Tehsil Lormi District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through The S H O Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

MCRCA No. 1567 of 2020

- Pappu Loniya @ Rajaram Loniya S/o Rajaram Loniya, Aged About 50 Years R/o Navrangpur, Post Ramhepur, Tahsil Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	Mr. Praveen Das and Mr. Vikash Pandey, Advocates
For Respondent /State	Mr. Ravish Verma, Government Advocate

SB.: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra
Order On Board

2/12/2020

1. Heard.
2. These are the two applications filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail to the

MCRCA No. 1104 of 2020 and another

applicants, who are apprehending their arrest in connection with Crime No.387/2020 registered at Police Station Lormi, District Mungeli (CG) for the offence punishable under Section 420 read with 34 of the IPC.

3. Perusal of the case diary would reveal that when the complainant applied for loan, he submitted quotation from one Preeti General Stores, however, after sanction of loan of Rs. One lakh, the cheques were issued and the articles/equipments for running of the salon were shown to have been supplied by Suresh General Stores, for which, the borrower had never submitted the quotation. Thus, the borrower never received any cash loan or the articles/equipments for running the salon shop. The borrower was served with a notice for repayment of loan of Rs.1,27,000/-, on which, he became aware that in the bank papers, he has been shown to have been disbursed loan of Rs. One lakh. The applicants have actively participated in following the entire loan transaction. The fraud is not only against the complainant but the same is also against the Bank.
4. Having seen the case diary and considering the nature of the offence, I am not inclined to exercise powers under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. to release the applicants on anticipatory bail.
5. The bail applications are dismissed. Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Judge