

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 2062 of 2019

Shalini Verma W/o Rupendra Verma Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Bade Mungi, Police Station Mandir Hasaud, Tahsil Arang, Civil And Revenue District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Acting Through Officer-In-Charge Police Station Mandir Hasaud, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant : Mr. L.K. Mishra, Advocate.

For Respondent/State : Ms. Hamida Siddiqui, Dy. A.G.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

Order On Board

10/08/2020

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. 194/2019, registered at Police Station Devendra Nagar, Distt. Raipur (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 of the IPC.
3. In this case there are total three accused persons. As per prosecution story, on 03.11.2019, one Trilok Singh lodged a complaint before concerned Police Station alleging therein that on 02.11.2018, the applicant along with other co-accused persons namely Rupendra Verma and BB Rao have induced him and one other person for providing job in *Gramin Khadya Yojna* and taken Rs. 50,000/- from each of them. Allegedly, they have given a forged joining letter to the complainant and one other person. On the basis of said complaint, offence has been registered.
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 the applicant and her husband Rupendra Verma are the employee of one Enclave Group Agency and co-accused BB Rao is the managing director of said agency. On 02.08.2018, the applicant has

given her resignation to the said agency and the same was accepted on 02.08.2018 itself. Therefore, the applicant had given joining letter to the complainant and one other person and taken money from them is suspicious. The Counsel further submits that the FIR has been lodged after one year of the incident, no custodial interrogation is required in the matter. Hence, it is prayed that the applicant may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.

5. Per contra, learned counsel appearing on behalf of State opposes the bail application.
6. I have heard learned Counsel for both 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 and further considering the fact that prior to the date of alleged incident, resignation of the applicant was already accepted. Without further commenting on other merits of the case, in my considered opinion, it is a fit case for grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.
8. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is allowed.
9. It is directed that in the event of arrest, the applicant shall be released on bail on furnishing a personal bond for a sum of Rs. 25,000/- with one solvent surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the officer arresting her and she shall abide by all the following terms and conditions:-
 - I. That accused/applicant shall made herself available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required;
 - II. The accused/applicant 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/applicant shall not act, in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial; and
 - IV. The applicant shall appear before the Trial Court on each and every date given to her by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-

(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge