



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 211 of 2026

1 - Naveen Sonvani S/o Ghanshyam Soni Aged About 45 Years R/o Ward No. 13, Fulwari Para, Tahsil - Bagbhaara, District : Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

... Petitioner

versus

1 - Sarvesh Chandrakar S/o Shiv Chnadrakar Aged About 34 Years Propreator Of Jai Ambe Construction, R/o Village- Navagaon Kala, Tahsil - Bagbahara, District : Mahasamund, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

09/03/2026	Mr. Rajbahadur Singh, counsel for the petitioner. Mr. Kamlesh Patel, counsel for the respondent. Heard on admission. Admit. Also heard on I.A. 01/2025, application for grant of stay. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent has filed a complaint case under Section 138 of N.I. Act, which has been registered as Criminal Case No. 1092/2023. After examination of the respondent, the learned trial Court has recorded the statement of the petitioner under Section 313 of Cr.P.C., and he had produced the defence witness. The respondent cross-examined the defence witness; thereafter, the learned trial Court after examination of the complainant witnesses and defence witnesses, fixed the case for final
-------------------	---



hearing. On the stage of final hearing, the respondent, intentionally for getting undue benefit, filed an application on 08.05.2025 for re-examination, producing and exhibiting the additional documents which he has not filed earlier at the time of filing the complaint and during his examination in chief and cross, before the learned trial Court. Thereafter, on 17.07.2025, the respondent again filed an application under Section 311 of Cr.P.C. for the same relief as he had earlier filed, and the same has been rejected on 16.06.2025. After that, the respondent has challenged the order dated 16.06.2025 by filing a revision before the learned Second Additional Sessions Judge, Mahasamund, District – Mahasamund, which has been allowed vide order dated 29.11.2025 passed in Criminal Revision No. H-52/2025, and the respondent has been permitted to produce additional evidence and documents at the stage of the final hearing of the case. As such, the learned revisional court erred in allowing the revision filed by the respondent, because the respondent had filed the application after completing the trial at the stage of final argument. Hence, the application may be allowed and a stay may be granted.

Learned counsel for the respondent opposes the arguments advanced by the counsel for the petitioner.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the effect and operation of the impugned order shall remain stayed till the next date of hearing.

List this case for final hearing in the month of **April, 2026.**

H.L. Sahu

Sd/-
(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge