

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRCA No. 455 of 2021**

Bhagirathi Sahu @ Manish Sahu S/o Shri Babu Lal Sahu Aged About 47 Years Caste Sahu R/o Village Nagarada, Police Station Bilaigarh, Civil And Revenue District Balodabazar Bhatapara Chhattisgarh,

(Wrongly Mentioned As S/o Babu Lal Rajak , R/o Ward No. 15, Janjgir , Police Station Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station Sirgitti, Civil And Revenue District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For applicant – Shri Paras Mani Shriwas, Advocate.

For Respondent/State –Smt. Astha Shukla, PL.

For objector – Shri K.P.S. Gandhi, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order****28/07/2021**

1. This application under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. has been filed by the applicant apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.93/2021 registered at Police Station Sirgitti, District Bilaspur (C.G.) for offence punishable under Section 420 of IPC.
2. As per the prosecution case, report was made by Amit Bosle with a allegation that to provide job in the RTO department the applicant has obtained Rs.2,45,000/- from the complainant.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that except the oral averments, the wild allegation no evidence is on record that there has been some monetary transaction took place and there has been some dispute occurred in between the applicant and the complainant, therefore false report has been made. He submits that the applicant may be granted benefit of anticipatory bail.
4. Per contra, learned State counsel and counsel for the objector

opposes the same. State counsel would submit that as many as three persons Amit Bosle, Sushant and Subangi in primary investigation it revealed to provide job in RTO the applicant has obtained more than Rs.10 lakhs and various statement are still under investigation.

5. Considering the nature of allegation, the applicant is absconding, the seriousness of allegation is required to be investigated for which custodial interrogation may be required, therefore it is not a case where benefit of anticipatory bail can be extended to the applicant.

6. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
JUDGE