



Cr-Rev. No. 693/06

मामला क्रमांक सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	<p><u>SB : HON'BLE SHRI DHIRENDRA MISHRA, J.</u></p> <p><u>APPLICANT</u></p> <p>Jageshwar alias Jage Sao, son of Dinbandhu Sao, aged about 42 years, occupation cultivation R/o Tarda, Police Station Pussore, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.)</p> <p>Vs.</p> <p><u>RESPONDENTS</u></p> <p>State of Chhattisgarh, through District Magistrate, Raigarh (C.G.)</p> <p><u>31-7-2007</u></p> <p>Shri A.K. Athaley, , Advocate for the applicant.</p> <p>Shri Pradeep Singh, Panel Lawyer for the State.</p> <p>This revision is directed against the judgment dated 14-11-2006 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Raigarh in Criminal Appeal No. 49/2006 whereby the appeal preferred by the appellant against the judgment dated 29-4-2006 passed in Criminal Case No. 443/2003 by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Raigarh has been partly allowed and appellant has been convicted under Section 325 of I.P.C. instead of Section 325/34 of I.P.C. and sentenced to undergo imprisonment for three months and fine of Rs. 8000/-, in default of payment of fine, to further undergo R.I. for 8 moths..</p> <p>Learned counsel for the applicant submits that co-accused Satyawan has been acquitted from the charges on the same set of evidence available on record and to that extent the judgment of the appellate Court is illegal.</p>	

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक 6-REV- No. 693/66 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश - 2 -	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	<p>On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the impugned judgment.</p> <p>Learned Sessions Judge after appreciating the evidence of complainant Premanand P.W. 1 and also statement of P.W. 7 Dr. Ravail Singh has convicted the applicant under Section 325 of I.P.C. and sentenced as mentioned above. The judgment is based on proper appreciation of the evidence available on record and the same is not perverse and no case is made out for any interference in the impugned order while exercising the revisional jurisdiction.</p> <p>The revision being devoid of substance is liable to be dismissed and it is dismissed.</p>	<p>Sd/- DHIRENDRA MISHRA Judge</p>