

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**MCRC No.9678 of 2021**

Ramanand Singh S/o Late Prabhu Singh Aged About 45 Years Present Resident  
Of Koyla Factory Gali, Pathalgaon, District : Jashpur, Chhattisgarh

**---- Applicant**

**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station Pathalgaon,  
District : Jashpur, Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondent**

**MCRC No. 9884 of 2021**

Rakesh Gupta Son Of Late Jogendra Gupta Aged About 50 Years Resident Of N-  
303, Atal Awas Housing Board Colony, Kotra Road, Raigarh, District-Raigarh  
(C.G.)

**---- Applicant**

**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Police Station - Pathalgaon,  
District- Jashpur (C.G.)

**---- Respondent**

---

|                        |   |                                                |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------------------------|
| For Applicants         | : | Shri Hari Agrawal, Advocate                    |
| For Respondent – State | : | Shri Gurudev I. Sharan, Dy. G.A. for the State |
| For Objector           | : | Shri Ashish Beck, Advocate                     |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Deepak Kumar Tiwari**

**Order On Board**

**20.12.2021**

1. As these two applications (MCRC No. 9678/2021 and MCRC No. 9884/2021)  
under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for grant of  
regular bail to the applicants, who are arrested in connection with common

Crime No. 272/2021, registered at Police Station – Pathalgaon, District – Jashpur, C.G. for the offence punishable under Sections 419, 420 and 120 B of the IPC, are being disposed off by this common order.

2. As per the prosecution case, the complainant is 74 years of age filed a written complaint to the effect that since the director of a NGO and the applicant Ramanand Singh was ex-employee and resigned from the said post in the month of June and finally relieved on 17.07.2021. The institution has a piece of land situated at Balrampur, which was agreed to be sold to one Vinod Agrawal and for the stamp duty a sum of Rs. 30 lakhs in cash has been delivered by the Vinod Agrawal in the institution for purchase of stamp duty and the remaining 20 lakhs consideration was promised to deliver in a week. Ramanand Singh with the conspiracy of the said co-accused persons send Rakesh Gupta co-accused depicting him to be from the Income Tax Department and the accused persons by cheating to victim obtain Rs.30 Lakhs cash kept with the institution office after some time when complainant reveals that the cheating has been done so she lodged FIR on 14.11.2021.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in the present case. The prosecution story is highly improbable calling to the applicant Ramanand Singh by the complainant during alleged raid was not within hands of this applicant and the amount was also not within the knowledge of the applicant – Ramanand Singh. Such huge amount of case was not required for purchase of stamp duty and the applicant Rakesh Gupta was arrested on 14.11.2021 and the applicant Ramanand Singh was arrested on 18.11.2021, there is no chance of tampering the prosecution evidence, so the applicants may be enlarged on bail.
4. Per contra, learned State counsel opposes the prayer for grant of bail.
5. Learned counsel for the objector strongly opposes the bail application and

submits that the complainant also provided the CCTV footage to police about the involvement of the present applicants, therefore, their applications may be rejected.

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly considering the fact that the victim is a 74 years of age old person and is working in an NGO and the accused- Ramanand Singh has been recently resigned from the job prior to said incident and the submission of counsel for the objector that the evidence of CCTV footage also provided to the police and the matter is under investigation till so far no recovery has been made, so this court does not find good ground to grant bail to the applicants at this stage, accordingly, the application is **rejected**.
7. However, the petitioner may be at liberty to revive the bail applications after three months, if any occasion arises.
8. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-

**(Deepak Kumar Tiwari)**  
Judge