

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
I.A. No. 8253 of 2026

in
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 818 of 2026

Uttam Munda **Appellant**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Respondent**
With

I.A. No. 4121 of 2026
in
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 383 of 2026

Bipin Munda @ Vipin Munda **Appellant**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR RAI

For the Appellant :Mr. Karan Sharma, Advocate
For the Res.-State :Mrs. Kumari Rashmi, A.P.P.

05/19.08.2026 Heard Mr. Karan Sharma, learned counsel for the appellant in both the cases and learned A.P.P. for the State.

These interlocutory applications have been preferred by the appellants for grant of bail to them during the pendency of these appeals.

The appellants have been convicted for the offences under Sections 366(A), 376(D) of IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act and have been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life which shall mean imprisonment for the remainder of their natural life along with a fine of Rs. 50,000/-.

It has been alleged that the victim no. 1/informant was subjected to rape by the accused persons.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellants that though it is said that several persons had committed rape upon the victim, who has been examined as P.W.-2, the medical examination, which was conducted on the next day, does not support such allegation. It has been submitted that, as per the

allegations, P.W.-2 and P.W.-3 were under the radar of the accused persons in order to satisfy their lust, but P.W.-3 had run away from the place of occurrence and, in fact, she has been declared hostile by the prosecution. It has been submitted that the DNA profiling test also does not conclusively prove that the appellants were involved in committing rape upon P.W.-2.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellants and has submitted that the prayer for bail of one of the similarly situated co-convicts, Sonu Lohra, has already been rejected by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1135 of 2025.

It appears that the victim, who has been examined as P.W.-2, has categorically named the present appellants as the persons who also ravished her along with four convicts, including Sonu Lohra. As has been stated by the learned A.P.P., the prayer for bail of Sonu Lohra has already been rejected in Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1135 of 2025.

Apart from the evidence of P.W.-2, there are other circumstances, including the report of the Forensic Science Laboratory, and on consideration of all aspects of the case, we are not inclined to admit the appellants on bail. Their prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

I.A. No. 8253 of 2026 and I.A. No. 4121 of 2026 stand rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)