



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 1227 of 2024HEMLAL NISHAD **versus** STATE OF CHHATTISGARH**Order Sheet**

22/08/2025	Mr. S.P. Sahu, counsel for the appellant. Ms. Sunita Manikpuri, Panel Lawyer, for the State. Heard on I.A.No.2 for suspension of sentence and grant of bail to the appellant. By impugned judgment dated 22.03.2024 passed in S.T.No.86 of 2021 by the Sessions Judge, Mahasamund, District Mahasamund, the appellant has been convicted and sentenced as under : <table><tr><td>U/s 306 IPC</td><td>:</td><td>RI for 7 years and fine amount of Rs.1000/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 1 month</td></tr><tr><td>U/s 201 IPC</td><td>:</td><td>RI for 1 year and fine amount of Rs.500/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 15 days</td></tr></table> Learned counsel for the appellant submits that P.W.4 Narayan Singh and P.W.6 Sunil Kumar Seth have categorically stated in their cross examinations that the deceased (wife of the accused) was suffering from kidney stone disease, due to which, she committed suicide and they further admitted the fact that since the accused transferred his 02 acres of land in favour of his elder daughter Jamuna Bai, for that reason P.W.1 Bhupendra, son of accused, has developed	U/s 306 IPC	:	RI for 7 years and fine amount of Rs.1000/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 1 month	U/s 201 IPC	:	RI for 1 year and fine amount of Rs.500/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 15 days
U/s 306 IPC	:	RI for 7 years and fine amount of Rs.1000/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 1 month					
U/s 201 IPC	:	RI for 1 year and fine amount of Rs.500/-, in default of payment of fine, additional RI for 15 days					

Rao	enmity with his father, the appellant. He submits that the statements of P.W.4 and P.W.6 further stood firm by the evidence of P.W.3 Rameshwar Bariha, therefore, the evidence of P.W.1 (son of appellant) cannot be given credence. He prays for suspension of sentence and releasing the appellant on bail. Per contra, learned State Counsel opposes the prayer and submits that because of the torture meted out by the appellant, the deceased wife committed suicide. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, I am not inclined to release the appellant on bail at this stage. Accordingly, I.A.No.2 is rejected. List the appeal for final hearing in the week commencing 6th October, 2025. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) Judge
-----	---