

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. A. (DB) No. 255 of 2024

Pappu Ansari @ Md. Shah Ajam @ Md. Shah Ajam Ansari, aged about 46 years, son of Late Suleman Ansari, resident of village Mazhar Tola, P.O. Borio, P.S. Borio (J), Dist.-Sahibganj

... .. **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... .. **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant	: Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwari, APP

Order No. 05/ Dated: 11th September, 2025

I.A. No. 11745 of 2025

Heard Mr. Gautam Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwari, learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This interlocutory 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 offences under Section 302, 394 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with fine of Rs. 50,000/- for the offence under Section 302 IPC.

4. It has been alleged that there was a scuffle between the appellant and the informant since the appellant had taken away an Umbrella with him without paying for it and subsequently in the evening the appellant had returned back and had fired a shot which hit the landlord of the informant resulting in his death.

5. Submission has been advanced by learned counsel for the appellant that there was no intention on the part of the appellant to fire at the landlord of the informant. It has further been submitted that the informant has not suffered any injury as no injury report has been brought on record. Learned counsel adds that the appellant is in custody since 18.08.2018.

6. Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwari, learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for the bail of the appellant.

7. The evidence of the informant who has been examined as P.W.-4 and who has given an eye witness account to the incident categorically reveals

that the landlord of the informant had died on account of the firing made by the appellant.

8. Regard being had to the above, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail and the prayer for bail is hereby rejected, at this stage.

9. The aforesaid I.A. stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Basant/Arpit