



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 2562 of 2025

1 - Urmila Rajak W/o Late Mahesh Ram Rajak Aged About 42 Years R/o Village Koteya, Tengapara, P.S. Pratappur, District-Surajpur (C.G.)

2 - Foolsundari Rajak W/o Shambhulal Rajak Aged About 35 Years R/o Village Koteya, Tengapara, P.S. Pratappur, District-Surajpur (C.G.)

... Appellants

versus

State of Chhattisgarh Through The Police Station Pratappur, District- Surajpur (C.G.)

... Respondent

Order Sheet

(Cause-title is taken from CIS)

16/03/2026	Mr V.K. Pandey, Advocate for the appellants. Mr. Amit Kumar, P.L. for the State/respondent. Heard on admission. Admit. Also heard on I.A. No.01/2025, application
-------------------	---

under Section 430 of BNSS for suspension of sentence and grant of bail to the appellants.

By the impugned judgment dated 25.11.2025 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Surajpur (C.G.), in Session Case No. 10/2023, whereby the appellants have been convicted and sentenced as under:-

Conviction	Sentence
U/s 304 Part II of IPC	R.I. for 7 years and fine of Rs. 1000/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 6 months to each of the appellant

Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the appellants are innocent and have been wrongly convicted. There is no material evidence available on record against them. He also submits that the appellants have already undergone about 11 months of jail sentence. They are still in jail from the date of judgment i.e. 25.11.2025. The conclusion of this appeal is likely to take some time. Therefore, the jail sentence of the appellants may be suspended till final disposal of the case.

On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application and submits that there is directed evidence against the appellants, therefore, they may not be released on bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the

Shubham	case and evidence on record, further considering that there is directed evidence against the appellants, without commenting on merits of the case, I am not inclined to allow IA No.01/2025. Accordingly, the application (I.A. No. 01/2025) is rejected. List it for final hearing after five weeks. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) Judge
---------	---