



2026:CGHC:3236-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 19 of 2020

- Sunil Kumar Agrawal, S/o Ramdas Agrawal, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Chaitanya Nagar, Dhimrapur Road, Tahsil & District Raigarh Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The District Magistrate Raigarh, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
2. Anil Kedia, S/o Narsingh Lal Kedia, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Vrindavan Colony, Tahsil & District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
3. Mahesh Kankarwal, S/o Kushiram Shriwas, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Gourishanker Mandir Road, Tahsil & District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondents

(Cause title taken from Case Information System)

For Applicant : Mr. Hari Agrawal, Advocate.

For State/Respondent No.1 : Mr. Amit Buxy, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal &

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sachin Singh Rajput

Order On Board

20/01/2026

1. The applicant has preferred this revision under Section 397 read with Section 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 challenging the legality, validity and correctness of order dated 25.09.2019, by which his acquittal appeal has been dismissed by the Sessions Judge, Raigarh in Criminal Appeal No.58/2018, confirming the order of acquittal dated 27.02.2018, passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Raigarh (C.G.) in Criminal Case No.3329/2005, whereby the respondents herein/accused persons have been acquitted of the charges under Sections 294, 506 part II, 392/34, 347/34, 427/34, 477/34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860.
2. Mr. Agrawal, learned counsel for the applicant submits that concurrent finding recorded by both the Courts below while acquitting the respondents are



perverse finding, therefore, the same deserves to be quashed. He further brought to our notice the evidence of PW-5, which has been ignored by both the Courts below, therefore, the impugned order of acquittal requires interference of this Court.

3. Learned State counsel supports the impugned orders and prays for dismissal of this revision.
4. We have heard learned counsel for the parties, considered their rival submission made herein above and went through the record with utmost circumspection.
5. In the present case, both the Courts below after appreciation of oral and documentary evidence, have clearly recorded a finding that no offence under Section 294, 506 part II, 392/34, 347/34, 427/34, 477/34 are made out and, therefore, the trial Court proceeded to acquit the respondents/accused persons, which was thereafter affirmed by the appellate Court. Furthermore, a perusal of the record would show that the applicant/Sunil Kumar Agrawal and the respondents- Anil Kedia and Mahesh Kankarwal all were partners in a partnership firm and, that being so, the dispute appears to be of civil nature and, as such, no criminal offence is made out and concurrent findings recorded by two Courts are based on material available on record, which is neither perverse nor contrary to record. Accordingly, we do not find any merit in this revision warranting interference of this Court. It deserves to be and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Sachin Singh Rajput)
Judge