

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3241 of 2026

1. Dhanwa Devi, Wife of Late Prayag Yadav
2. Dulari Devi, Wife of Binod Yadav
... .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Jaleshwari Devi, W/o Arjun Yadav
... .. Opposite Parties

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Rishabh Kaushal, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Satish Prasad, Advocate

05/18.04.2026

Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are in custody since 19.01.2026 in connection with S.T. No. 63 of 2026 arising out of Protest Complaint Case No. C-334/2006 and Bishnugarh P.S. Case No. 1 of 2006, registered under Sections 304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under section 3 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, SC/ST, Hazaribag.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioner no. 1 is the sister-in-law of the victim and petitioner no. 2 is the daughter of the sister-in-law of the victim. He submits that the petitioners have no concern with the matrimonial life of the victim and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He has further stated that the husband of the victim faced the trial and he has been acquitted.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the case was instituted as back as in the year, 2006. The petitioner no. 1 was enlarged on bail in the year 2011 and petitioner no. 2 was enlarged on bail in the year 2008 and they violated the conditions of bail and were declared absconder. Ultimately, they surrendered and now they are facing the trial. He submits that the trial has already commenced, but out of six

prosecution witnesses, no one has been examined till 11.03.2026.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the petitioners were declared absconder, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

6. So far as the acquittal of the husband of the victim is concerned, the same has no bearing in the matter as the petitioners did not participate in the trial.

7. However, the State is directed to take prompt steps for production of witnesses.

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

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:18.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:20.04.2026