



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRA No. 89 of 2026

1 - Satyam Alias Yagyanarayan Jaiswal S/o Late Puroshottam Jaiswal, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Sohagpur, Chowki Kranji, Police Station Bishrampur, District Surajpur C.G.

... Appellant

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Bishrampur, District Surajpur C.G.

... Respondent

Order Sheet

27/02/2026	Ms. Sweksha Sharma, Advocate for the Appellant. Mr. Anish Tiwari, Dy.G.A. for the State/respondent. Heard on admission. Admit. Record of the trial Court is received. Also heard on I.A. No. 01/2026, application under Section 430 of BNSS for suspension of sentence and grant of bail. By the impugned judgment dated 28.11.2025 passed by learned 03rd Additional Sessions Judge, Surajpur, District-Surajpur (C.G.) in Sessions Case No. 26/2024, the appellant has been

convicted and sentenced as under:-

Conviction	Sentence
U/s 307 of IPC.	R.I. for 07 years and fine of Rs. 10,000/-, in default of payment of fine amount additional R.I. for 01 year.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant is innocent and has been falsely implicated. She argues that the prosecution has failed to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt and committed a grave lapse by not subjecting the appellant to medical examination, despite being aware through witnesses that the appellant suffered from an abnormal mental condition at the time of and prior to the alleged incident. She further submits that prosecution witnesses Investigating Officer Arun Kumar (PW-10), Babulal (PW-12), and Jai Prakash Kujur (PW-8) have categorically stated that the appellant suffered from an abnormal mental condition at the time of the incident, and there was no motive or intention behind the alleged offence. The appellant has been in jail since 03.02.2024, serving about 2 years and 24 days of his sentence and the disposal of this appeal is likely to take considerable time, therefore, considering all these facts the jail sentence of the appellant may be suspended till the final disposal of the appeal and the appellant be released on bail.

	On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the bail application, submitting that the victim suffered an injury to a vital part of his body caused by an iron rod, therefore, considering the nature and gravity of offence, the applicant should not be granted bail. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, particularly the nature and gravity of the offence and the material available on record against the appellant, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the appellant. Accordingly, I.A. No. 01/2026 is rejected. List this case for final hearing in the month of April, 2026. Sd/- (Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal) Judge
--	--

Sourabh P.