

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 375 of 2026

Janeshwar Singh **Appellant**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Respondent**
With
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 473 of 2026

Shakuntala Devi **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. Rishi Pallava, Advocate
For the Res.-State :Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, A.P.P.

04/13.08.2026 I.A. No. 8926 of 2026 in

Cr. App. (DB) No. 473 of 2026

Heard Mr. Rishi Pallava, learned counsel for the appellant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

This interlocutory application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Sections 302/201/120B of IPC and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with a fine of Rs. 20,000/-

It has been alleged that the son of the informant went missing and suspicion was cast upon the appellant and Janeshwar Singh for being involved in such disappearance.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the only incriminating circumstance against the appellant is that the deceased was last seen with the appellant in the market. It has been submitted that, so far as the recovery of the dead body of

the son of the informant is concerned, the same was made on the basis of the confessional statement of co-convict Janeshwar Singh.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

It appears from the evidence of the witnesses that there was an illicit relationship between the appellant and Janeshwar Singh, which was the cause of suspicion of the informant upon the appellant as well. It further appears that the appellant had confessed after the confession of Janeshwar Singh, and the skeleton of the son of the informant was recovered, which was ascertained to be that of the son of the informant by virtue of the DNA test. The appellant appears to be the wife of the deceased, and the evidence of the witnesses does project a strong circumstance of the involvement of the appellant in doing away with the life of her husband on account of the illicit relationship she was having with Janeshwar Singh.

Regard being had to such strong circumstantial evidence, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Her prayer for bail is hereby rejected

I.A. No. 8926 of 2026 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

13.08.2026
Umesh-Abhishek/-