

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 146 of 2022
With
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 181 of 2022

Suraj Pandit Appellant
(in Cr. Appeal DB No. 146 of 2022)

Rupesh Prasad Appellant
(in Cr. Appeal DB No. 181 of 2022)

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMBUJ NATH

For the Appellants : Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent : Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Special P.P.

7/28.11.2022 I. A. No. 1354 of 2022: (in Cr. Appeal DB No. 146 of 2022) &
I. A. No. 4304 of 2022: (in Cr. Appeal DB No. 181 of 2022)

Heard Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel appearing for the appellants and Mrs. Priya Shrestha, learned Special P.P. appearing for the State.

Both these interlocutory applications have been preferred by the appellants for grant of bail to them during the pendency of this appeal which arose out of a common judgment dated 20.12.2021 passed in S. T. No. 326 of 2015 by the learned Additional Sessions Judge V, Gumla.

The appellants have been convicted for the offences under Sections 364 A, 302 and 201 of Indian Penal Code and have been sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life for the offences under Section 364 A and 302 I.P.C.

It has been alleged that the informant arrived in the clinic of Dr. R. B. Choudhary, who is doctor in Sadar Hospital, Gumla and on 30.04.2015, the doctor went out of his clinic and thereafter went on a scooty along with a person with whom he was having conversation. It has further been alleged that a ransom of Rs. fifty lac was made. Subsequently, the dead body of the doctor was recovered from a jungle. It appears that so far as the appellant – Suraj Pandit in Cr. Appeal DB No.

146 of 2022 is concerned, the prosecution has been able to establish the fact that the doctor after abduction was kept in his house and the DNA profile further reveals the presence of the appellant Rupesh Prasad in Cr. Appeal DB No. 181 of 2022.

In view of the DNA report, the active participation of both the appellants have come to the fore and in such circumstances, we are not inclined to grant bail to them.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellants is rejected.

Both the I.As stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J)

(Ambuj Nath, J.)