

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**B.A. No. 4261 of 2026**

Binit Kumar Singh @ Vinit Singh @ Vinit Kumar Singh, son of late
Nirmal Singh **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Dr. Suvendu Jaipuria, Advocate
: Mr. Sanjay Kumar Upadhyay, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Praful Jojo, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Amit Kr. Choubey, Advocate

05/10.06.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.05.2025 in connection with P.S. Patan Case No.88/2025, S.T. No.311 of 2025, registered under Sections 80, 61 (2), 352, 351 (2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3 & 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 and Section 27 of Arms Act, 1959, now pending in the court of learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Palamu.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the husband of the victim but he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has further submitted that the marriage was solemnized on 07.02.2025 and the victim died out of bullet injury on 19.05.2025 and she was taken to the hospital by her father and that nothing was recovered from the house.

4. The learned counsel has also submitted that the arm was recovered near a tree outside the house of the petitioner and the confessional statement of the petitioner has no evidentiary value. He submits that so far as the witnesses to the seizure of arms are concerned, there is no independent witness; therefore, there is no likelihood of conviction of the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is direct and specific allegation of demand of dowry and the arms were recovered on the basis of confessional statement of the petitioner which was used for the

commission of offence. The victim died within less than 4 months of marriage and the petitioner is the husband.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner and the arms having been recovered on the basis of confessional statement of the petitioner, who is the husband of the victim, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

7. At this, the learned counsel for the Informant has submitted that out of 17 witnesses, 6 have already been examined and only official witnesses are left.

8. The State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced.

9. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned district and also to Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:10.06.2026

Saurav

Date of Uploading:10.06.2026