



Digitally
signed by
RAVI
SHANKAR
MANDAVI
Date:
2026.01.20
17:16:51
+0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 2027 of 2024

KULDEEP KUMAR DHEEMAR *versus* STATE OF CHHATTISGARH,

Order Sheet

20/01/2026	Mr. Prahalad Panda, counsel for the appellant. Ms. Laxmin Kashyap, PL for the State. Heard. Admit. Record of the trial Court is received. Also heard on I.A. No. 01/2024, application under Section 430 (2) of B.N.S.S. for suspension of sentence and grant of bail. By the impugned judgment dated 13.09.2024 passed by learned 6th Additional Sessions Judge, Durg, District Durg (C.G.) in Sessions Case No. 105/2019, the appellant has been convicted and sentenced as mentioned below : <table><tr><th>Sl.</th><th>Conviction</th><th>Sentence</th></tr><tr><td>1.</td><td>Under Section 307 of IPC</td><td>R.I. for 10 years and fine of Rs.1,000/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 3 months.</td></tr><tr><td>2.</td><td>Under Section 342 of IPC</td><td>R.I. for one year and fine of Rs.100/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 15 days.</td></tr></table> Both the sentences are directed to run concurrently.	Sl.	Conviction	Sentence	1.	Under Section 307 of IPC	R.I. for 10 years and fine of Rs.1,000/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 3 months.	2.	Under Section 342 of IPC	R.I. for one year and fine of Rs.100/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 15 days.
Sl.	Conviction	Sentence								
1.	Under Section 307 of IPC	R.I. for 10 years and fine of Rs.1,000/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 3 months.								
2.	Under Section 342 of IPC	R.I. for one year and fine of Rs.100/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 15 days.								

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that there is no material on record on the basis of which appellant's conviction can be sustained. He further submits that the prosecution has failed to prove the entire prosecution case beyond reasonable doubt. He next submits that Appellant was detained in judicial custody from 12.04.2019 and disposal of this appeal is likely to take considerable time, therefore, he may be enlarged on bail.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the application for suspension of sentence and grant of bail and supported the impugned judgment.

I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of offence, the material collected and available on record against the applicant, I do not find it appropriate to release the appellant on bail.

Accordingly, I.A. No. 01/2024 is **rejected**.

List this case for final hearing **in the week commencing 16th February, 2026**.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)

Judge