

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****MCRCA No. 1243 of 2020**

1. Smt. Sunita Jagatramka W/o Shri. Anant Jgatramka, aged about 46 years,
2. Anant Jagatramka S/o Ganesh Jgatramka, aged about 52 years, Occupation Business,  
Both R/o Shyam Takiz Road, Raigarh (C.G.)

**---- Applicants****Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh through Police Station Chakradhar Nagar, District Raigarh (C.G.)

**---- Respondent**


---

|                |   |                                     |
|----------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| For Applicant  | : | Mr. Sanjay Agrawal, Advocate        |
| For Respondent | : | Mr. Ghanshyam Patel, Govt. Advocate |
| For Objector   | : | Mr. Vipin Punjabi, Advocate         |

---

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

**Order on Board****06/10/2020**

1. The matter is heard through video conferencing.
2. The applicants have filed this application under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C for grant of anticipatory bail as they are apprehending their arrest in connection with Crime No. 213/2020 registered at police station – Chakradhar Nagar, District Raigarh (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 452 & 323/34 of the IPC.
3. In this case, both the applicants are son and daughter-in-law of the Complainant. According to the case of the prosecution, on 12/08/2020 at about 3:00 pm, it is alleged that the applicants entered into the house of the Complainant and pressurized her to put signature on

blank paper. On her denial, the applicants beaten the complainant and returned from there. On 18/08/2020, an FIR has been lodged by the Complainant. On the basis of the said FIR, offence has been registered.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case due to previous dispute. Virtually in the month of January, husband of the Complainant tried to outrage the modesty of applicant No.1 and at that time, the matter was reported by applicant No.1. Thereafter, to create pressure, a false and fabricated report has been lodged. He prays to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the said application.
6. I have heard counsel for the parties.
7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly considering that the applicants are real son and daughter-in-law of the Complainant, there is a property dispute between both the parties and also other litigations, therefore, without further commenting on other merit of the case, I am inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed.
9. It is directed that in the event of arrest, the applicants shall be released on bail on each of them furnishing a bond in the sum of Rs.10,000/-

with one surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the officer arresting them and they shall abide by all the following terms and conditions:

- i. That, the accused/applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required;
- ii. The accused/applicants 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/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;
- iii. The accused/applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
- iv. The applicants shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

10. Certified copy, as per rules.

**Sd/-**  
**(Arvind Singh Chandel)**  
**Judge**

Rahul