

Ashok Nagrani vs The State Of Madhya Pradesh on 3 September, 2021

Author: Rajendra Kumar Verma

Bench: Rajendra Kumar Verma

1
The High Court Of Madhya Pradesh
MCRC-39244-2021
(ASHOK NAGRANI Vs THE STATE

1
Jabalpur, Dated : 03-09-2021
Shri D.K. Melani, learned counsel for the
Shri Satyapal Chadar, learned Government A
respondent/State.

Arguments heard.

Case diary perused.

This is the first application filed by applicant Ashok Nagrani under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail.

The applicant is apprehending his arrest in connection with Crime No.438/2021, registered at Police Station Gwarighat, District-Jabalpur for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 468 and 471 of the IPC and Sections 103 and 104 of Trade and Marks Act, 1999 and Sections 51 and 52 of Food Safety and standard Act, 2006.

As per prosecution case, Police received an information that some person was selling food articles at Gali No.5 Polipathar, Jabalpur without having any license or authority. The police raided the premises of the applicant and found that he was selling some food articles having license and some of the other articles having no license. The Police seized the food articles from his possession and on the basis of the aforesaid complaint, police registered an FIR against the applicant.

Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is innocent person and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that according to FIR, no offence punishable under Section 420, 468 and 471 of the IPC has been committed by the applicant. He also submits that neither the applicant was selling any duplicate articles nor he has cheated to anyone. Therefore, it has been prayed that applicant be released on anticipatory bail.

2 MCRC-39244-2021 Learned Government Advocate for the respondent/State, on the other hand, has opposed the bail application. He submits that there is prima-facie evidence available against the applicant, therefore, he prays for rejection of this application.

After hearing learned counsel for both the parties and on a perusal of the material available on record including the case diary, this Court is of the view that it is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to the applicant.

Accordingly, this first application filed by the applicant under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of anticipatory bail is hereby dismissed.

(RAJENDRA KUMAR (VERMA)) JUDGE vai