CGHC010368292019 2026:CGHC:43886

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Criminal Revision No.1379 of 2019

1 - Rameshwar Manhare S/o Sukhnand Manhare Aged About 48 Years R/o Village Dumardih Dhamdha District Durg Chhattisgarh.

2 - Kumari Bai W/o Rameshwar Manhare Aged About 45 Years R/o Village Dumardih Dhamdha District Durg Chhattisgarh.

3 - Chowa Ram S/o Rameshwar Manhare Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Dumardih Dhamdha District Durg Chhattisgarh.

4 - Krishna S/o Rameshwar Manhare Aged About 27 Years R/o Village Dumardih Dhamdha District Durg Chhattisgarh.

... Applicants

versus

State Of Chhattisgarh Through District Magistrate Durg Chhattisgarh Police Station Nandininagar District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Non-Applicant

For Applicants	**:**	None.
For Non-Applicant/State	**:**	Shri Saumya Rai, Dy. G.A.

SISTLA NEELIMA VISHNU PRIYA

Digitally signed by SISTLA NEELIMA VISHNU PRIYA

Hon'ble Shri Sudhir Kumar, Judge
Order on Board

09.10.2026

1. The present Criminal Revision has been preferred against the judgment dated 06.09.2019 passed by the 1st Additional Sessions Judge of the 1st Additional Judge, Durg (C.G.) in Criminal Appeal No.26/2019, arising out of the judgment dated 08.01.2019 passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Durg (C.G.) in Criminal Case No.1785/2010, whereby the Applicants have been convicted under Sections 452/34, 323/34, 294 and 506 Part-II of the IPC and sentenced to undergo imprisonment till the rising of the Court and pay a fine of Rs.1,000/- each under Section 452 of the IPC, fine of Rs.500/- each under Section 323 of the IPC, fine of Rs.250/- each under Section 294 of the IPC and fine of Rs.500/- each under Section 506 Part-II of the IPC with usual default stipulations with a direction that all the sentences shall run concurrently.

2. The facts of the case, in brief, are that on 23.06.2008 at about 5:30 p.m., the Applicants/accused persons allegedly entered the house of the complainant Smt. Ferahibai and assaulted her with a piece of wood and a stick, as a result of which she sustained injuries. Thereafter, the complainant lodged a

report at Police Station Nandini Nagar, on the basis of which the police registered an FIR against the Applicants and other accused persons. Upon completion of the investigation, the police filed the charge-sheet before the competent Court.

3. The grounds raised in the Revision are that the concaerned Courts have failed to properly appreciate the evidence on record, particularly the omissions and contradictions in the statements of the complainant and other prosecution witnesses, the delay of about two years in lodging the complaint and the alleged land dispute between the parties. It is further contended that the prosecution has failed to establish the charges beyond reasonable doubt and that the Applicants have been falsely implicated. However, none appears on behalf of the Applicants to advance the submissions.

4. Contrarily, learned Counsel for the State supported the judgment impugned.

5. I have heard learned Counsel for the State, perused the impugned judgment and also gone through the record carefully.

6. Upon careful scrutiny of the impugned judgment passed by the Appellate Court and the material available on record, this

Court finds that the evidence has been duly appreciated in its proper perspective and the findings recorded by the Appellate Court are well-reasoned and supported by the evidence on record and no perversity, illegality, infirmity or error of law or fact warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction has been demonstrated.

7. Accordingly, the present Criminal Revision, being devoid of merit, is hereby **dismissed**.

8. As per the record, the Applicants have already undergone the sentences imposed upon them and therefore, they are not required to surrender before the concerned Court.

Sd/-

(Sudhir Kumar)
Judge

Priya