

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 8221 of 2021**

- Pankaj Yadav, S/o Late Gokul Yadav, aged about 34 Years, R/o Village- Dongla (Portha), P.S. - Sakti, Tahsil- Sakti, District- Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant

Versus

- State of Chhattisgarh, Through the District Magistrate, Janjgir-Champa and Station House Officer, Police Station - Sakti, District – Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh.

----Non-applicant

For Applicant	Shri Hari Agrawal, Advocate.
For State	Shri Anand Verma, Deputy G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Gautam Chourdiya
Order on Board

22/10/2021

1. Heard on admission.
2. The application is admitted for hearing.
3. With the consent of the parties, the matter is heard finally.
4. Earlier the applicant had filed first bail application i.e. MCRC No.9140 of 2020 which was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court on 24.02.2021 and the second bail application i.e. MCRC No.3523 of 2021 was dismissed on merits by this Court on 22.07.2021.
5. The applicant has preferred this third bail application under Section 439 of Cr.P.C. as he has been arrested in connection

with Crime No.43/2020 registered at Police Station Sakti, District Janjgir-Champa, C.G. for the offence punishable under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code.

6. As per the prosecution case, complainant B.S. Nayak, District Registrar, Janjgir-Champa made a report in the police station alleging therein that on 14.11.2019 during inspection in the Sub-Registrar Office, embezzlement of registration money of Rs.50,09,159/- was found. It is alleged that the applicant along with other co-accused was involved in this crime.
7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that applicant is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that applicant has not played any role in alleged offence. The applicant is in jail since 23.08.2020, charge sheet has already been filed and conclusion of trial is likely to take some time. Therefore, the applicant be released on bail.
8. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application.
9. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
10. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the fact that the second bail application of the applicant has already been rejected on merits, there is no change in the circumstances and the trial has already commenced, I do not find any reason to allow this bail application. Accordingly, the bail application is rejected. However, considering the detention period of the applicant, the trial

Court is directed to expedite the trial and conclude the same as early as possible. If the trial is not concluded within a period of one year from today, the applicant shall be at liberty to repeat his prayer for bail.

Sd/-
Gautam Chourdiya
Judge

Akhilesh