

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRCA No. 647 of 2015

1. Jakir Khan Fajil Khan Aged About 40 years R/o Mungeli, Police Station & Tahsil - Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
2. Alok Singh S/o Krishna Bihari Singh Aged About 25 Years R/o Mungeli, Police Station & Tahsil - Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
3. Vinod Yadav S/o Ramlakhan Yadav Aged About 42 Years R/o Mungeli, Police Station & Tahsil - Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh
4. Monu Singh S/o Surendra Singh Aged About 29 Years R/o Mungeli, Police Station & Tahsil - Mungeli, District Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Applicants

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Station House Officer, Police Station - Mungeli, District - Mungeli Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	-	Shri Goutam Khetrapal, Advocate
For Respondent /State	-	Shri Vinod Tekam, Panel Lawyer

Order On Board

31/07/2015

Heard.

1. The applicants are apprehending their arrest in connection with Crime No.383/2014 registered by Police Station- Mungeli, District Mungeli for alleged commission of offences under Sections 147, 148, 149, 307 & 327 of IPC.
2. Prosecution case is that the applicants with intent to murder, assaulted the complainants Sanjay Singh and also one Vijay Singh.
3. Learned counsel for the applicants submits that it was a trivial dispute because of settlement of accounts, the complainant themselves are assailants because they had rushed to dwelling place of applicant No.1 and started

threatening him. There was an intention to murder. He further submits that during the pendency of investigation, Pramod Singh and Sanjay Singh have filed affidavits that they have settled their dispute with the applicants.

4. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes prayer for grant of bail and submits that present is a case of fight amongst those involved in operation and running of liquor shops. The incident happened in the night and Sanjay Singh sustained as many as nine injuries and was also admitted in the hospital.

5. Taking into consideration, the nature of allegation and that the role alleged to be played by the applicant, no case for grant of anticipatory bail is made out, I am not inclined to extend the benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants.

6. The bail application is therefore rejected.

Sd/-

Manindra Mohan Shrivastava

J U D G E