



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR
CRA No. 1800 of 2025

Suddhu Singh Urf Nan Baba Sadan Singh Aged About 40 Years Niwasi Gram -
Andhibar Nawa Para, Thana- Khadganva, Jila - M.C.B. (C.G.) ... **Appellant(s)**

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Aarakshi Kendra, Khadgavan, Jila- M.C.B. (C.G.)
... **Respondent(s)**

(Cause title is taken from the CIS)

Order Sheet

17.10.2025	Shri Abdul Moin Khan, counsel for the appellant. Shri Sanjeev Kumar Pandey, Dy AG for the State. Heard on IA-1 of 2025, application for suspension of sentence and grant of bail. Learned counsel for the appellant would submit that appellant has been convicted for the offence under Section 304 Part-II of the IPC, and sentenced to under RI for five years with fine of Rs.500/- with default stipulation. However, there is no evidence with respect to the fact that the appellant has connected the live electricity connection from the high voltage current. It is further submitted that it

is only presumption that live electricity wire was connected by the appellant by which the son of the complainant came into contact, and died due to shock. During trial, appellant was on bail and not misused the liberty given to him. Now, he is in jail from the date of judgment of the trial court. Appeal is of the year 2025, and will take its own time for its final adjudication, therefore, appellant may be enlarged on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application, and would submit that from the evidence of PW1-Shivnarayan Singh, PW2-Dharampal Singh, PW3- Mahesh Singh, PW4-Ashok Singh, and PW5-Deepak Kumar, it comes that the appellant has admitted the fact that he layed the electricity wire to kill animal, and he had eaten those animals came into contact with the live wire, and unfortunately, son of the complainant came into contact and ultimately, he died. From the evidence of doctor, death of the deceased was also due to electrocution. From the present appellant, electric wire has been seized, therefore, there is sufficient evidence against the present appellant that he committed the offence, and he is not entitled for bail.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record

of the trial Court.

Considering the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, nature of allegation made against the appellant, and the evidence available on record, material collected during the investigation, further, that the death of the deceased was due to electrocution, and there is evidence with respect to involvement of the present appellant, which comes from the statement of PW1, PW2, PW3, PW4, PW5, and PW6, I am not inclined to allow the application for suspension of sentence and grant of bail at this stage.

Accordingly, IA-1 of 2025 is rejected.

List the case for final hearing after 8 weeks.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
JUDGE

padma