

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A. B. A. No. 1887 of 2026

Krishna Jha @ Debya Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner: Ms. Vinita Prakash, Advocate

For the State: Mr. V. K. Sinha, A.P.P

02/10.04.2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehending her arrest in connection with the case registered under Sections 105/110/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 has prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the petitioner along with two other accused persons, namely, Anita Devi and Kishan @ Nikhil Sarewar had moved this Court for grant of anticipatory bail by filing A.B.A. No. 6392/2024. This Court, vide order dated 10.12.2024, had granted anticipatory bail to Anita Devi and Kishan @ Nikhil Sarewar, however, the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail was rejected. By way of present anticipatory bail application, the petitioner has renewed her prayer for anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that the petitioner is a 65-year-old lady suffering from various ailments. She had no intention so as to cause any harm to the informant and others. Moreover, collapse of the house wall cannot be attributed to the petitioner. Since it was a rainy season, the house wall suddenly collapsed for which the petitioner cannot be said to be responsible. It is also submitted that since co-accused, namely, Anita Devi and Kishan @ Nikhil Sarewar have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail may sympathetically be considered.
4. Learned A.P.P while opposing the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail, submits that this Court while earlier rejecting the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail, had thoroughly considered the materials on record and keeping

in view that she was the owner of the house, the support wall of which was removed without taking any protective measures resulting in collapse of the structure, her prayer for anticipatory bail was rejected. It is also submitted that three persons including the husband of the informant got buried under the debris of the structure and died. Moreover, there is no change of circumstance in this case. Therefore, the petitioner may not be given the privilege of the anticipatory bail.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering that earlier the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail was considered and rejected by this Court vide order dated 10.12.2024 passed in A.B.A. No. 6392/2024 and that no new material has been placed so as to reconsider the same, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in connection with Deoghar Town P.S. Case No. 405/2024.

6. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is accordingly rejected.

Satish/-

(RAJESH SHANKAR, J)