

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. A. (DB) No. 527 of 2024

1. Mukesh Turi, aged about 23 years, son of Late Jodhi Turi, resident of village-Maheshpur, P.O. & P.S.-Domchanch, Dist.-Koderma,
2. Kanchan Devi, aged about 22 years, wife of Mukesh Turi, resident of village-Maheshpur, P.O. & P.S.-Domchanch, Dist.-Koderma,
3. Bachan Turi @ Bachchan Kr. Turi, aged about 24 years, son of Saryu Turi, resident of village -Behradih, P.O. & P.S.-Domchanch, Dist.-Koderma,
4. Bangali Turi, aged about 23 years, son of Baiju Turi, resident of village-Maheshpur, P.O. & P.S.-Domchanch, Dist.-Koderma

... .. **Appellants**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... **Respondent**

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

For the Appellant No.2 : Mrs. Pinki Kumari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Saket Kumar, A.P.P.

Order No. 10/ Dated: 30th January, 2026

I.A. No. 982 of 2026

Heard Mrs. Pinki Kumari, learned counsel for the appellant No.2 and learned A.P.P.

2. This interlocutory application has been preferred for grant of bail to the appellant No.2.
3. The appellant No.2 has been convicted for the offences under Sections 302/34 & 201/34 of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life along with fine of Rs. 25,000/- for the offence under Section 302/34 of the I.P.C.
4. It has been alleged that the son of the informant was murdered and his body was thrown at the roadside.
5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant No. 2 that the appellant No.2 has been implicated primarily on account of the fact that there was an illicit relationship between the deceased and the appellant No.2 though none of the witnesses have said so in their evidence. It has been submitted that on the joint confessional statement of the co-convict appellant No.1 and the appellant No.2, a blood stained jeans pant and a knife were recovered from the house of

Bachan Turi. Learned counsel submits that Bachan Turi has been granted bail by this Court in I.A. No. 7343 of 2025. Learned counsel adds that the appellant No.2 is in custody since 04.07.2020.

6. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for the bail of the appellant No.2.

7. Regard being had to the fact that the convict from whose house certain incriminating materials were recovered having already been granted bail by this Court and the fact that there are circumstantial evidence, so far as the appellant No.2 is concerned, we are inclined to admit the appellant No. 2 on bail. Accordingly, during the pendency of this appeal, appellant No.2, above named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned District & Additional Sessions Judge-III, Koderma, in S.T. Case No. 58 of 2020, arising out of Nawalsahi P.S. Case No. 56 of 2020.

8. The aforesaid I.A. stands allowed and disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

30.01.2026

Arpit

Uploaded on 06/02/2026