CGHC010340292026 2026:CGHC:44911

NAFR

RUKHSAR BANO
Digitally signed by RUKHSAR BANO
Date: 2026.10.16 17:09:00 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 1159 of 2026

1 - Smt Sukhmani Sahu W/o Rakesh Sahu Aged About 37 Years R/o Manas Nagar Ward No. 17 Chowk, C.S.E.B. Korba, Tahsil And District- Korba, (C.G.)

... Applicant

versus

1 - Purushottam Singh Sahu S/o Late Ghanshyam Singh Sahu Aged About 56 Years R/o B/64 Driling Camp Subhash Block S.E.C.L. Korba, Tehsil And District- Korba, (C.G.)

... Respondent

(Cause title, as taken from CIS system)

For Applicant	:	Mr. Shivang Dubey, Advocate.
For Respondent	:	--

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

16/10/2026

1. The registered notice issued to the respondent has been returned unserved with the report that he has left the given address.
2. Heard on I.A. No.01/2026, an application for condonation of delay in filing the present revision.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the impugned judgment dated 14.08.2023 passed by the learned I Additional Sessions Judge,

Korba (C.G.), in Criminal Appeal No.68/2022 was decided *ex parte*, i.e., in the absence of the applicant herein/accused. Therefore, the applicant was not aware of the impugned judgment and came to know about it only when a warrant of arrest was issued against her by the executing Court. Hence, a delay of 1,015 days occurred in filing the present revision, which deserves to be condoned.

4. As per the submission made on behalf of the applicant, the impugned judgment dated 14.08.2023 was passed *ex parte*, i.e., in the absence of the applicant/accused, Smt. Sukhmani Sahu. However, upon perusal of the impugned judgment passed by the Appellate Court, it does not appear that the judgment was passed in the absence of the applicant. Rather, the order reflects that the arguments on behalf of the applicant herein/appellant/accused were advanced by her counsel before the judgment was pronounced. Therefore, the ground raised by the applicant to explain the delay in filing the present revision, particularly a delay of 1,015 days, is not found to be *bona fide*.

5. Having considered the substantial delay of 1,015 days and the absence of any *bona fide* ground to justify the same, this Court is of the considered view that the delay cannot be condoned. Accordingly, I.A. No.01/2026, an application for condonation of delay, is rejected. Consequently, the present criminal revision is dismissed.

6. Pending interlocutory application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge

Rukhsar