

  
**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN**  
**BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous Bail Application No. 16333/2023

Ravi Kant Sharma S/o Suraj Sharma, Aged About 32 Years, R/o C-46, Saraswati Nagar, Sushilpura, Sodala, Jaipur Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Pp
2. Sanjay Gupta S/o Nand Kishore Gupta, R/o C9, Barwada House Colony, Ajmer Road, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

---

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Harsh Tikoo
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Riyasat Ali-PP


---

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAVEER BHATNAGAR**

**Order**

**31/05/2024**

1. Apprehending his arrest in connection with FIR No.84/2023 registered at Police Station Jyoti Nagar, District Jaipur City (South) for the offence(s) under Sections 420 and 406 of IPC, the petitioner has preferred this anticipatory bail application under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
2. Learned counsel for the accused-petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The allegations levelled in the FIR are totally false. The petitioner has not forged any documents. The allegations of opening the fake accounts in the name of Ajay Gupta, Siya Gupta, Sanjay Gupta and Nand Kishore Gupta are totally false. He further submits that custodial investigation of the accused petitioner is not required, therefore, the anticipatory bail of accused-petitioner may be allowed.



3. Learned Public Prosecutor vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and produces the factual report. The same is taken on record.

4. I have considered the overall allegations levelled in the FIR and contentions made by the counsel for the parties.

5. In the factual report, the investigating agency after collecting the documents, arrived at the conclusion that petitioner opened the accounts in the name of Ajay Gupta, Siya Gupta, Sanjay Gupta and Nand Kishore Gupta and also updated the mobile numbers and after forging the documents, transferred the LIC Policies of complainant Sanjay Gupta, his brother and daughter in the forged accounts. Thus, it is apparent that petitioner is involved in the said offence, therefore, considering the gravity of the offence, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. Hence, the bail application filed under Section 438 of Cr.P.C. on behalf of accused-petitioner is hereby dismissed.

(PRAVEER BHATNAGAR),J