

(2026:JHHC:12013)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 1369 of 2026

Praween Dang @ Rewt, aged about 24 years, son of Irbin Dang @ Adwin Dang, resident of Village-Chimtighat, Brabar Pani, P.O. & P.S.-Simdega, Dist.-Simdega (Jharkhand)

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Pramila Kerketta, w/o late Robert Kerketta, r/o Village-Bhawarpani, Bhandartoli, P.O., P.S. & Dist.-Simdega

... Opposite Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Gaurav, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Shashi Kr. Verma, Addl. P.P.
For O.P. No.2	: None

Order No.03 Dated- 23.04.2026

Heard the parties.

Though notice has validly been served to the opposite party no.2 yet no one turns up on behalf of the opposite party no.2 in-spite of repeated calls.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Simdega P.S. Case No. 41 of 2025 corresponding to S.T. Case No. 67 of 2025 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 14.11.2025 passed in B.A. No. 6172 of 2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed murder of Deepak Kerketta on the allegation that he has committed theft of bullocks. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is submitted that the informant is not the eye-witness of the occurrence. It is then submitted that in the meanwhile, four witnesses have been examined by the prosecution in this case. It is further submitted that though the PW-1 & 2 have categorically stated that the petitioner and the co-accused Praween Dang & Olia

Dang caught-hold of Deepak Kerketta and were beating him but in para-3 of their respective cross-examinations, they have stated that they themselves have not seen the occurrence. It is then submitted that PW-3 & 4 have not supported the case of the prosecution and even though they were declared hostile and prosecution was permitted to put leading questions to them, still they did not support the case of the prosecution. It is then submitted that the petitioner is a young boy of 24 years. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 15.04.2025 as mentioned in para-18 of the instant bail application. It is also submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-18 of the bail application. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes to co-operate with the trial of the case and also undertakes not to annoy or disturb the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the co-accused person with similar allegation has already been admitted to bail by this Court vide order dated 15.04.2026 in B.A. No.1233 of 2026. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the facts of this case, the above-named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Simdega in connection with Simdega P.S. Case No. 41 of 2025 corresponding to S.T. Case No. 67 of 2025 with the condition that he will co-operate with the trial of the case and furnish his mobile number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card in the court below with an undertaking that he will not change his mobile number during the trial of the case and he will not annoy or disturb the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)