

(2026:JHHC:12774)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3610 of 2026

Sushila Shahdeo, aged about 49 years, W/o Late Kabir Kumar Singh and D/o Vinay Raj Singh @ Major V.R. Singh, resident of Barkagarh, Jagarnathpur, P.O. and P.S. -Dhurwa, District - Ranchi.

	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	...	Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Nilesh Kumar, Advocate
	: Ms. Priyanka Agrawal, Advocate
For the State	: Mrs. Vandana Bharti, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 30.04.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Dhurwa (Hatia) P.S. Case No.321 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 318(4), 316(2), 337, 338, 336(3) & 61 of the B.N.S., 2023.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has executed a power of attorney claiming to be the owner of the property, the ownership of which is also claimed by the informant and in exercise of the power vested upon the power of attorney holder Dharmendra Kumar Verma and Aryan and they in exercise of the power vested upon by the said power of attorney have executed a sale deed in favour of Bikash Kumar Singh. It is next submitted that the petitioner in the recital of the power of attorney and in the sale deed has claimed that she is the owner of the property and there is no allegation of any impersonation by the petitioner. It is then submitted that the petitioner has not executed any power of attorney in favour of Dharmendra Kumar Verma or Aryan but the co-accused persons have fraudulently and dishonestly obtained the signature of the petitioner and the petitioner has not received

any money in respect of the sale of the land to the co-accused Bikash Kumar Singh and others. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is then submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as has been mentioned in para -17 of the bail application. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 13.01.2026, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 20 of the bail application. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the trial of the case and further undertakes that she will not annoy or disturb the informant or the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail.

Considering the submissions of the counsels and the fact as discussed above, I am inclined to enlarge the above-named petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi, in connection with Dhurwa (Hatia) P.S. Case No.321 of 2025 with the condition that the petitioner will co-operate with the trial of the case and will furnish her mobile number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card with an undertaking that she will not change her mobile number during the trial of the case, with further condition that she will not annoy or disturb the informant or the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

30.04.2026
Sonu/