

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No.511 of 2025

Chhatiswar Lohra @ Chhateshwar Lohra aged about 60 Years S/o
Late Jiru Lohra R/o Village-Murumgarha P.O. & P.S.- Thakurgaon
District – Ranchi (Jharkhand) ... Appellant

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Respondent

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant : Mr. K.S. Nanda, Adv.
For the State : Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, Spl. P.P.
For the Informant : Mrs. Nivedita Kundu, Adv.

Order No.04/Dated- 15.04.2026

I.A. No.4820 of 2026

1. Heard Mr. K.S. Nanda, learned counsel for the appellant and learned Spl. P.P. assisted by Mrs. Nivedita Kundu, learned counsel appearing for the informant.
2. This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.
3. The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Sections 302/34 and 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with fine of Rs.20,000/- for the offence under Section 302/34 of the I.P.C.
4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the appellant that the dead body was recovered in the presence of the appellant as well as the other co-convicts. Learned counsel submits that some of the co-convicts have been granted bail by this Court in Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 423 of 2025 and the case of the present appellant stands on a similar footing. Learned counsel has copiously referred to the evidence of the Investigating Officer, who has been examined as P.W.9, in order to substantiate

his contention that the dead body was recovered in the presence of all the convicts.

5. Learned Spl. P.P. as well as learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

6. The allegations reveal that the son of the informant had gone out of the house with Bharat Nayak, Anil Goswami and Akshay Nayak but he did not return and after few days, when the informant had gone to the house of the appellant, he was told that his son has been sent to Tripura for work. It appears that though some of co-convicts have been granted bail in Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 423 of 2025 but the evidence of P.W.9 categorically reveals that it was at the instance of the appellant who had initially confessed that the dead body of the son of the informant was recovered from a ditch.

7. Regard being had to the evidence of the Investigating Officer which clearly distinguishes the case of the present appellant with that of the co-convicts, who have been granted bail as noted above, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. His prayer for bail is hereby rejected.

8. Accordingly, I.A. No.4820 of 2026 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Dated: 15th April, 2026

Sachin/

Uploaded on: 17/04/2026