

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 530 of 2025

Malti Devi Appellant

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Respondent

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

For the Appellant : Ms. Amrita Sinha, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, A.P.P.

I.A.(Cr.) No. 6026 of 2025

03/18.09.2025 Heard Ms. Amrita Sinha, learned counsel for the
appellant and Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, learned A.P.P. for the
State.

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

The appellant has been convicted for the offences
u/s 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code and has been
sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with a fine of Rs.
10,000/- for the offence u/s 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been alleged that the brother of the
informant had gone somewhere on 25.08.2020 but he did not
return and on 28.08.2020 the villagers had informed that a
dead body was lying in the well in the paddy field which was
subsequently detected to be that of the brother of the
informant.

Submission has been advanced by the learned
counsel for the appellant that so far as the present appellant
is concerned, she happens to be the wife of the deceased. She
has submitted that admittedly there are no eyewitnesses to
the occurrence and on the confession of the appellant
recovery was made from the well of a sword with its cover
which has not been ascertained to be the murder weapon.
Learned counsel further submits that the other circumstance
which has been projected by the prosecution is that the
appellant used to have conversation with several males as per

the call details and it was presumed that she was having a physical relationship with all those persons. Learned counsel, therefore, submits that weak circumstantial evidence has formed the basis for conviction of the appellant.

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

Admittedly, there are no eyewitness to the occurrence and the circumstances which have been projected by the prosecution does not indict the appellant in the commission of the murder of her husband.

Regard being had to the above, we are inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, during the pendency of this appeal, the appellant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-XVI, Dhanbad in Sessions Trial No. 64/2021, arising out of Rajgunj P.S. Case No. 37/20, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 2870/20.

I.A.(Cr.) No. 6026 of 2025 stands disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Dated, the 18th September, 2025
A. Sanga/-