

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

Criminal Appeal No. 611 of 2021

- Gangaram Patil S/o Late Ramailal Patil, aged about 48 years, R/o. Village-Fari, Post – Beejabhat, District/Tahsil – Bemetara (C.G.)

---- Appellant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through Thana- Bemetara, District - Bemetara (C.G.)

---- State/Respondent

And

Criminal Appeal No. 660 of 2021

- Netram @ Netu son of Shiv Patil, aged about 55 years, resident of Kari, Police Station & District- Bemetara (C.G.)

---- Appellant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh Through : Station House Officer, Police Station- Bemetara, District Bemetara (C.G.)

---- State/Respondent

For Appellant	:	Shri Samir Singh, Advocate appears in Cr.A. No. 611/2021
For Appellant	:	Shri Vipin Singh, Advocate appears in Cr.A. No. 660/2021
For Respondent /State	:	Shri K.K. Singh, Government Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Gautam Chourdiya, J

Judgment on Board

11.08.2021

1. The appeal (Cr.A. No. 611/2021) by accused/appellant Gangaram Patil under Section 14A (2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 is directed against the order dated 09.04.2021 passed by the Sessions Judge, District Bemetara (C.G.) in Bail Application No. 123/2021, rejecting his regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C.
2. The appeal (Cr.A. No. 660/2021) by accused/appellant Netram @ Netu under Section 14A (2) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes

(Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 is directed against the order dated 21.05.2021 passed by the Special Judge constituted under Section 14 of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, District Bemetara (C.G.), rejecting his regular bail under Section 439 Cr.P.C.

3. As above both the appeals preferred by the respective appellants arise out of the same Crime Number i.e. 231/2021 registered in Police – Bemetara, District Bemetara (CG) for the offence punishable under Sections 376-D, & 506 of IPC and Section 3 (2) (v) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 against both the appellants, they are being disposed of by this common order.
4. As per State counsel, notices have been served upon the prosecutrix in both the appeals, but neither the prosecutrix is present nor is there any representation on her behalf.
5. Shri Samir Singh and Shri Vipin Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective appellants, seek to withdraw these appeals with liberty to file a fresh appeal(s) as and when occasion arises.
6. Accordingly, both the appeals (Cr.A. No. 611/2021 & Cr.A. No. 660/2021) are dismissed as withdrawn with the liberty as stated above.
7. Certified copies of the impugned orders of the trial Court be returned to the counsel for the respective appellants after retaining the photocopies of the same.

Sd/-

(Gautam Chourdiya)
Judge