

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 2149 of 2019**

1. Dinesh Verma, S/o Dukhan Singh Verma, Aged About 54 Years, Samiti Prabandan Avam Fad Prabhari, R/o Village Chourenga, P. S. Simga, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
2. Ashwani Yadav, S/o Dhanau Yadav, Aged About 20 Years Computer Operator, R/o Chandiya, Pakhra, P. S. Simga, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.
3. Dhanesh Dhritlahare, S/o Shobharam Dhritlahare, Aged About 28 Years, Vardana Prabhari, R/o Village Tulsi, P. S. Simga, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicants**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through P. S. Simga, District Balodabazar-Bhatapara, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicants : Shri A.S. Rajput, Advocate.

For Respondent/State : Shri Anand Verma, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel**Order On Board****03/01/2020**

1. The applicants have preferred this first bail application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. for apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 502/2019 registered at Police Station - Simga, District – Balodabazar-Bhatapara, (C.G.), for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 418 & 420 of Indian Penal Code.
2. As per the prosecution story, on 04.12.2019 during sudden investigation at Paddy Purchase Centre, Dhekuna, it was found that there was excess of paddy (511 sacks) amounting Rs. 5,11,000/- was stored. At that time applicant No. 1 Dinesh Verma was the manager of

Paddy Purchase Centre, applicant No. 2 Ashwani Yadav was the computer operator and applicant No. 3 was the employee of the said Paddy Purchase Centre. Allegedly, on 03.12.2019 applicants have issued token against rules in favour of nine farmers and stored total 511 sacks of paddy in the Paddy Purchase Centre and thereby they have committed the alleged offence. On the basis of the above, offence has been registered.

3. Learned Counsel appearing for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submits that no case is made out against applicants. If the entire case is taken as it is, it seems that applicants have only violated some rules while purchasing of paddy. Therefore, no case of cheating or forgery is established against applicants. Looking to the above, applicants may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.
4. Learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application.
5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available with due care.
6. Taking into consideration the submissions put-forth on behalf of the parties, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, evidence collected by the prosecution, without further commenting on other merits of the case, I am inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the present applicants.
7. Accordingly, the bail application is allowed.
8. It is directed that in the event of arrest of the applicants in connection with the aforesaid crime, they shall be released on anticipatory bail on each of them furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 20,000/- with one solvent surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the Arresting Officer/Presiding Officer of the concerned trial Court. They shall also abide by all the following terms and conditions :

- (i) They 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 fact to the Court,
- (ii) They shall not act in any manner which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial, and
- (iii) They shall appear before the trial Court on each and every date given to them by the said Court till disposal of the trial.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge