



Digitally signed
by SHUBHAM
SINGH
RAGHUVANSHI
Date:
2026.03.02
10:54:46 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 325 of 2026

Pooja Soni @ Juli W/o. Late Vinay Soni, Aged About 25 Years R/o.
Mahalpara Baikunthpur, Police Station And Tahsil Baikunthpur,
District Korla (C.G.)

--- Appellant

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Police Of Police Station Kotwali
Ambikapur, District Surguja (C.G.)

--- Respondent

CRA No. 511 of 2026

Saurabh Soni S/o Naresh Kumar Soni Aged About 24 Years R/o
Mayapur, Ambikapur, Thana And Tehsil- Ambikapur, District-
Surguja (C.G.)

---Appellant

Versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through - Police Station Kotwali,
Ambikapur, District- Surguja (C.G.)

--- Respondent

Order Sheet

28/02/2026	Mr. Kanhaiya Ram Yadav, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Govind Prasad Dewangan, Advocate for Appellant in CRA No.325/2026. Ms. Hamida Siddiqui, Advocate for Appellant in CRA No.511/2026. Mr. Tarkeshwar Nande, P.L. for the State/Respondent. Heard on admission. The appeals being arguable, are admitted for hearing. Also heard on IA No.1/2026 of both cases for suspension of sentence and grant of bail to the Appellants. By the impugned judgment of conviction and sentence dated 24.01.2026 passed in ST No.100/2020, by the learned 5th Additional Sessions Judge, District Surguja (C.G.), the appellants stand convicted and sentenced as under:- <table><tr><th>Conviction</th><th>Sentence</th><th>In Default</th></tr><tr><td>U/s 306 of IPC</td><td>RI for 5 years and fine of Rs.200/-</td><td>Additional RI for 20 days</td></tr></table> Learned Counsels appearing for the appellants submit that the appellants have been wrongly convicted by the Trial Court in the judgment without	Conviction	Sentence	In Default	U/s 306 of IPC	RI for 5 years and fine of Rs.200/-	Additional RI for 20 days
Conviction	Sentence	In Default					
U/s 306 of IPC	RI for 5 years and fine of Rs.200/-	Additional RI for 20 days					

there being any sufficient evidence available on record. They further submit that suicidal note has not been proved as father and mother have not confirmed the handwriting. The handwriting expert has also not been examined before the Trial Court. A love marriage was solemnized between the deceased and Appellant Saurabh. A compromise has also been taken place between them wherein, the allegation of illicit relationship has not been mentioned. Apart from this, prior to the incident, mother of appellant Saurabh has also filed a report against the deceased alleging that the deceased threatens to implicate her child in a false case. There is nothing on record to show that the appellants in any matter have instigated the deceased to commit suicide. The appellants are in jail since 24.01.2026 and the appeals are likely to take some time to be finalized, therefore, it is prayed that the bail applications may be allowed.

On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for the State opposes the bail application and supported the impugned judgment. He submits that there is sufficient evidence available on record against the appellants that they have instigated the deceased. There was an illicit relationship between both the appellants and this fact has also been mentioned in the suicidal note (Ex.P-8) of the deceased. Hence, looking to the nature of offence committed by the appellants, it is prayed that the bail applications of

Shubham	the appellants may be rejected. Considering the totality of the facts, evidence of the case and nature of offence, without commenting on merits of the case, this Court is of the opinion that it will not be proper to release the appellants on bail. Accordingly, the bail applications (IA No. 01/2026) are rejected. List the cases for final hearing after four weeks. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) JUDGE
---------	--