

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 2093 of 2026

Shambhu Gope, S/o Baldeo Gope **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... **Opposite Party**

— — —

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

— — —

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

: Ms. Arpita Sinha Sarkar, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sardhu Mahto, APP

For the Informant : Mr. Raj Nandan Chatterjee, Advocate

■■■

05/10.04.2026

Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2025 in connection with Govindpur P.S. Case No. 534 of 2025, registered under Sections 80(2)/238, 3(5) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the court of learned JMFC, Dhanbad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the body of the victim was found in the well which is actually 100 meters away, but it is shown to be just 50 meters away from her matrimonial home. The petitioner is the father-in-law and the learned counsel has referred to Annexure-2 to the bail application, which is said to be the dying declaration of the victim and he submits that though it was not seized by the police, but the petitioner has annexed it along with the bail application.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that there was a case under section 376 of the Indian Penal Code against son of the petitioner which was Sessions Trial No. 481 of 2023 in which there was a compromise between the parties and ultimately, the victim turned hostile. He submits that thereafter the marriage was performed with the victim and the victim was ultimately found dead.

5. The learned counsel also submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the husband of the victim was not coming home for the last 10 days and for that reason,

she committed suicide.

6. Learned counsel for the informant, while opposing the prayer, has submitted that all the witnesses during investigation have supported the prosecution case. He submits that after the case under section 376 of IPC was compromised, the victim was brought to her matrimonial home within one month after marriage and immediately before the incident, she was tortured. He has also submitted that there is mark of strangulation by rope on the body of the victim in the post-mortem report and injury was found by hard and blunt substance.

7. Learned counsel for the informant has also submitted that there is an allegation of demand of motorcycle and money.

8. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State has also opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the case under section 376 of IPC was compromised and ultimately, when the victim was taken to her matrimonial home, she was tortured and she was found dead in the well with injuries on her body. He submits that the well is near the matrimonial home of the victim.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the serious nature of allegation involved in this case including the demand of dowry and torture of the victim, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

10. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through "FAX/email".

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:10.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:14.04.2026