



ITEM NO.5

COURT NO.17

SECTION II-E

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s). 17593/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 09-12-2025 in 1A No. 33377/2024 in CRA No.10969/2022 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh Principal Seat at Jabalpur]

RAVI @ RISHIKESH MISHRA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 158216/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING  
IA No. 158218/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILEING / CURING THE DEFECTS  
IA No. 158217/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 26-05-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, Adv.  
Mr. Rajiv Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Pathak, Adv.  
Mr. Kisalaya Shukla, AOR  
Mr. Krishna Kant Shukla, Adv.  
Mr. Subodh Kumar, Adv.  
Ms. Shruti Mishra, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Surjeet Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Harmeet S.Ruprah, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Heard Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and Mr. Surjeet Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State, on advance notice.

2. Delay condoned.

3. The present petition calls in question the correctness of the order dated 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2025 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Jabalpur in IA No.33377 of 2024 in Criminal Appeal No.10969 of 2022.

4. By the said order, the High Court has declined the benefit of suspension of sentence and enlargement of bail to the petitioner. The petitioner stands convicted for the offences punishable under Sections 376(1) read with 34 and 506 Part II of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 66(E) and 67(A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and sentenced to undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for 10 years along with appropriate sentence for fine and default stipulations.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of fixed sentence of 10 years, the petitioner has undergone 5 years and 8 months. Learned counsel also contends that even according to the prosecution, the sexual assault was committed by the juvenile co-accused. The only allegation attributed to him is of the act of filming the deed. Learned counsel further submits that the Criminal Appeal filed by the petitioner before the High Court is of the year 2022 and is likely to take some time for disposal.

6. Mr. Surjeet Singh, learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State vehemently opposes the prayer for suspension of sentence.

7. Considering the overall facts and circumstances and the fact that the petitioner has undergone 5 years and 8 months, out of fixed sentence of 10 years and keeping in mind the fact that the criminal appeal is likely to take some time for hearing, we are inclined to suspend the sentence and enlarge the petitioner on bail, pending disposal of the criminal appeal by the High Court.

8. We direct that pending hearing of Criminal Appeal No.109679 of 2022, the sentence of the petitioner is suspended and the petitioner is enlarged on bail, subject to the satisfaction of the Trial Court.

9. In view of the above, the Special Leave Petition is disposed of.

10. Pending application shall also stand disposed of.

(ANITA MALHOTRA)  
AR-CUM-PS

(KOMAL)  
COURT MASTER