



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JODHPUR**



D.B. Criminal Misc. IInd Suspension Of Sentence Application
(Appeal) No. 1036/2026
CNR: RJHC010552292026
URN: SOSA / 2237U / 2026

Smt Ghadse Seema Gulab W/o Deceased Kaushalraj @ Hareesh
D/o Gulab, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Phule Nagar, Village
Manjal, P.s. Manjal City District Beed (Maharashtra) At Present
Machhi Market, Near Lohars Masjid, Sadar Bazar, Jodhpur (Raj.).
(Presently In Open Air Camp, Mandor Jodhpur).

----Applicant

Versus

State Of Rajasthan, Through PP

----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Rohit Singh Rawal Mr. Sawpan Chouhan
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Rajesh Bhati, PP

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINIT KUMAR MATHUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR SHARMA**

Order

14/07/2026

1. The appellant-applicant herein has been convicted and sentenced as below vide judgment dated 10.10.2019 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Jodhpur Metro, in Sessions Case No.81/2016 (NCV No.138/2016):-

Offence	Sentence	Fine
302 of IPC	Life Imprisonment	Fine of Rs.1,000/- and in default of payment of fine, Three Months Simple Imprisonment.

2. The appellant-applicant has preferred the application for suspension of sentence under Section **430 BNSS, 2023 (389**



Cr.P.C) during the pendency of the appeal and for release on bail. Earlier application seeking suspension of sentence was dismissed on 26.02.2020.

3. The only plea raised by learned counsel for the appellant-applicant is that as the applicant is in custody for more than 10 years and there is no chance of hearing of the appeal in near future, thus, in view of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 15.09.2022 in ***Sonadhar v. The State of Chhattisgarh : SLP (Crl.) No.529/2021***, the sentence of the applicant be suspended and he be enlarged on bail.

4. Further submissions have been made that there are no reasons and / or extenuating circumstances for denial of bail. Submissions have also been made with reference to order dated 05.10.2021 in ***Saudan Singh v. The State of Uttar Pradesh : SLP (Crl.) No.4633/2021***, wherein also observations have been made regarding grant of bail in the appeal at the High Court stage except certain exceptions and that none of the exceptions are applicable in the present case.

5. Learned Public Prosecutor opposed the application for suspension of sentence. However, he has not denied that the appellant-applicant has already undergone sentence of more than 10 years during trial and after sentence.

6. We have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and have perused the material available on record.

7. Looking to the fact that criminal appeals pertaining to year **2008** are pending for hearing, there is no likelihood of hearing of the present appeal in near future.



8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Sonadhar** (supra), while dealing with SMW (Crl.) No.4/2021 pertaining to 'life convicts in jail whose appeals are pending before the High Court' inter-alia, issued the following directions:-

"We consider appropriate to issue directions in terms of the aforesaid suggestions to the Patna High Court and on a *pari materia* basis to even the other High Courts. However, in order to carry out this exercise, the data would have to be compiled of such of the persons who have been in custody for more than 10 years and more than 14 years, with these persons being considered for grant of bail pending appeal, if there is no chance of hearing of the appeal in the near future, unless there are reasons for denial of bail. We can understand if any of the parties is delaying the appeal itself but short of that, we are of the view that all persons who have completed 10 years of sentence and appeal is not in proximity of hearing with no extenuating circumstances should be enlarged on bail."

9. Prior to that in the case of **Saudan Singh** (supra) also observations were made regarding grant of bail in cases where convicts have undergone sentence for sufficiently long time and appeals were pending at the High Court stage with exceptions indicated therein.

10. In the present case as observed herein-before, the appellant-applicant has already undergone sentence for more than 10 years and apparently, there are no chances of hearing of the present appeal in near future. Except for the fact that the appellant-applicant was involved in offence leading to her conviction for life, nothing has been brought on record by way of extenuating circumstances for denial of suspension of sentence.

11. Consequently, following the order in the case of **Sonadhar** (supra) and observations made in **Saudan Singh** (supra), without making any observations on merits of the case and only on account of the fact that more than 10 years' sentence has already



been undergone by the appellant-applicant, we are inclined to suspend the substantive sentence of the appellant-applicant, namely, **Smt Ghadse Seema Gulab W/o Deceased Kaushalraj @ Hareesh** during the pendency of the appeal.

12. Accordingly, the instant second application for suspension of sentence filed under Section **430 BNSS, 2023 (389 Cr.P.C.)** is allowed and it is ordered that substantive sentence passed by learned Sessions Judge, Jodhpur Metro, in Sessions Case No.81/2016 (NCV No.138/2016) against the appellant-applicant, namely, **Smt Ghadse Seema Gulab W/o Deceased Kaushalraj @ Hareesh**, shall remain suspended till final disposal of the aforesaid appeal and she shall be released on bail, provided she executes a personal bond in the sum of Rs.50,000/- with two sureties of Rs.25,000/-, out of which one surety will be of her close relative, each to the satisfaction of learned trial Judge for his appearance in this court on **17.08.2026** and whenever ordered to do so till the disposal of the appeal on the conditions indicated below:

1. That she will appear before the trial court in the month of **January** of every year till the appeal is decided.
2. That if the applicant change the place of residence, she will give in writing her changed address to the trial Court as well as to the counsel in the High Court.
3. Similarly, if the sureties change their address they will give in writing their changed address to the trial court.

13. The learned trial court shall keep the record of attendance of the accused-applicant in a separate file. Such file be registered as Criminal Misc. Case relating to original case in which the accused-applicant was tried and convicted. A copy of this order shall also



be placed in that file for ready reference. Criminal Misc. file shall not been taken into account for statistical purpose relating to pendency and disposal of the cases in the trial court. In case the said accused-applicant do not appear before the trial court, learned trial Judge shall report the matter to the High Court for cancellation of bail.

(CHANDRA SHEKHAR SHARMA),J

(VINIT KUMAR MATHUR),J