

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3176 of 2026

Prem Murmu, Son of Baneshwar Murmu
... .. Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Suraj Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Ms. Ruby Pandey, APP

- 05/17.04.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 16.04.2025 in connection with S.T. Case No. 298 of 2025 arising out of Barwadda P.S. Case No. 39 of 2025 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 1494 of 2025, registered under Section 108 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-X, Dhanbad.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case although he is the husband of the victim. The marriage was solemnized in the month of June, 2024 and the victim was found dead in her matrimonial house on 23.02.2025. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that as per the First Information Report, the victim died of strangulation, but this is not matching with the post-mortem report. He has also submitted that the petitioner is alcoholic and some incident might have happened.
4. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that as per the impugned order dated 17.03.2026 itself, it has been mentioned that the trial is likely to conclude soon.
5. To this, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that only three witnesses have been examined till 26.02.2026. He submits that the next date in the trial is 20.04.2026.
6. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State has submitted that

the witnesses will be promptly produced before the learned court.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact the petitioner is the husband of the victim and the victim died in her matrimonial house within a period of less than one year of marriage and there is also an allegation of demand of dowry, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

8. However, the State is directed to promptly produce the remaining witnesses before the learned court so that the trial is taken to a logical end.

9. 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.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:17.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:17.04.2026