



CRA No. 582 of 2026

1 - Bhim Lakda S/o Late Shanichara Lakada Aged About 29 Years
R/o Tharki P.S. Rajpur, Distt. Balrampur Ramanujganj,
Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through P.S. Rajpur, Distt. Balrampur
Ramanujganj, Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent

Order Sheet

16/03/2026	Ms. Prachi Diwan, Advocate for the Appellant. Mr. Aman Tamrakar, P.L. for the State. Heard on admission. Admit. Also heard on I.A. No. 01/2026, which is an application for suspension of sentence and grant of bail. By the impugned order dated 16.02.2026 passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Fast Track Special Court (POCSO Act), ramanujganj District Balrampur-Ramanujganj (C.G.) in Special Sessions (POCSO) Trial No. 09/2024, the appellant has been convicted and sentenced as mentioned below : <table border="1"> <tr> <td align="center">Conviction</td><td align="center">Sentence</td></tr> </table>	Conviction	Sentence
Conviction	Sentence		

	Offence under Section 452 of IPC	R.I. for 03 year and fine of Rs.1000/-, in default of payment of fine amount, Additional R.I. for 1 month.
	Offence under Section 354 of IPC	R.I. for 03 year and fine of Rs.2000/-, in default of payment of fine amount, Additional R.I. for 3 month.
	Offence under Section 323 of IPC	S.I. for 06 months and fine of Rs.300/-, in default of payment of fine amount, s S.I. for 07 days.
	Offence under Section 506 Part-II of IPC	S.I. for 06 months and fine of Rs.200/-, in default of payment of fine amount, S.I. for 07 days.
	Offence under Section 8 of POCSO Act	R.I. for 03 year and fine of Rs.2000/-, in default of payment of fine amount, Additional R.I. for 3 month.
(All the sentences were directed to run concurrently)		

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. The maximum sentence imposed upon the appellant i.e., R.I. for 03 years out of which he has already served the jail sentence of about 7 months and 12 days during trial. He further submits that the appellant is currently on bail, therefore, it is prayed that I.A. No. 01/2026 may be allowed and the jail sentence of the appellant may be suspended till the final disposal of the case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application submits that the appellant has one criminal antecedents under the Excise Act.

I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties and perused the material available on record.

Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case and the fact that the appellant has already on bail, the final disposal of this appeal is likely to take considerable time, therefore, I find it appropriate to allow the application (I.A. No. 01/2026) and suspend his jail sentence during pendency of this appeal.

Accordingly, the I.A. No. 01/2026 is **allowed**

The execution of substantive jail sentence imposed upon the appellant shall remain suspended during the pendency of this appeal on executing a personal bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- with one

Arpan	surety for the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned trial Court for his appearance before the Registry of this Court on 16.06.2026. He shall thereafter appear before the trial Court on a date to be given by the Registry of this Court and shall continue to appear there on all such subsequent dates as are given to him by the said Court, till disposal of this appeal. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) Judge
-------	---