

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No.185 of 2025

Ashok Gorai		---	Appellant
	Versus		
The State of Jharkhand		---	Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rongon Mukhopadhyay
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ambuj Nath

For the Appellant: Mr. D.K. Karmakar, Advocate
For the Resp.-State: Mrs. Shweta Singh, A.P.P.

I.A.No. 5382 of 2025

05 / 08.07.2025 Heard Mr. D.K. Karmakar, learned counsel for the appellant and Mrs. Shweta Singh, learned A.P.P for the State.

2. This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

3. The appellant has been convicted for the offence under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life alongwith fine of Rs.1,00,000/- for the offence under section 302 of IPC.

4. It has been alleged that the sister of the informant who was married with the appellant was murdered by throttling her neck and thrusting a rod in her private parts.

5. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that the marriage was never solemnized with the deceased and the appellant. It has further been submitted that there are no eye witnesses to the occurrence. Reference has been made to the evidence of the Investigating Officer who had been examined as PW9 in order to substantiate the fact that no one had seen the incident.

6. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant and has referred to the evidence of PW3. She has categorically stated that at the time of the incident, all the labourers had left and the appellant as well as the deceased and their children were present. It has further been submitted that the appellant was living with the deceased. She has also relied upon the evidence of PW2 who had stated that it was the appellant who had called over telephone and had disclosed that it was the appellant who had committed the murder of the sister of the informant.

7. It appears that there are strong circumstances of the appellant committing the murder of the deceased and the post-mortem report further indicates the brutality of the assault committed upon her.

8. On such consideration, therefore, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, his prayer for bail is hereby rejected.

9. The aforesaid interlocutory application stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J)

(Ambuj Nath, J)

RKM