

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3372 of 2025

1. Santosh Rana, S/o Shalik Rana, R/o Panchayat Rasanjori, Village Rasanjori, P.O. Phuljhariya, P.S. Ahilyapur, District Giridih.
2. Malti Devi, W/o Wakil Rana, R/o Panchayat Rasanjori, Village Koldih, P.O. Phuljhariya, P.S. Ahilyapur, District Giridih.

... **Petitioners**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Manju Devi, W/o Late Misraj Rana, R/o Udnabad, P.O. & P.S. Giridih, District Giridih.

... **Opposite Parties**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner:	Mr. Ajit Kumar, Sr. Advocate Ms. Shatakshi, Advocate
For the State:	Mr. Shailesh Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

05/ 07.07.2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita has been preferred by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Ahilyapur P.S. Case No.19 of 2024 for offences registered under Sections 302 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of the Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Giridih.

3. As per the First Information Report, it has been alleged by the informant that her deceased daughter's marriage was solemnized 12 years ago. After marriage her daughter faced mental and physical assault in the hands of her in-laws. A panchayat was also convened to settle the matter. However, on 08/05/2024 the informant was informed by the father in-law of the deceased that their daughter has drowned in the well. The informant further alleges that the accused persons always demanded Rs.1,50,000/- from their deceased daughter with threat that if not paid, they will not let her live in their house. It has been alleged that for dowry only the in-laws have killed the deceased and thrown in the well.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have never assaulted or harassed the deceased and have been falsely implicated in the present case. He submits that the petitioner No.1 is the brother-in-law and the petitioner No.2 is the mother-in-law of the deceased. There is no evidence or any eye witness in this case to support any overt act

by the petitioners. It is merely on assumption and suspicion the petitioners have been roped in this case.

5. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the husband of the deceased has stated that there were disputes between the deceased and the in-laws and the deceased had separated her kitchen but the in-laws continued torturing her. Many times panchayat was also held to pacify the matter. Co-accused father in-law has surrendered before the Court but the petitioners have been absconding.

6. After hearing the counsel for the parties and going through the records, I find that there are serious and direct allegations against the petitioners. From the case diary I find that the husband of the deceased has also supported the allegations of torture by the petitioners. He has also stated that on 06.05.2024 also the deceased was assaulted by the petitioners and in this regard a Panchayati was held on 08.05.2024 evening at 06.00 p.m. and on 08.05.2024 itself, his father had informed him that his wife has died due to drowning in well. The other independent witnesses examined in course of investigation, namely, Sanjay Rana, Aklu Mandal have also supported the allegation of torture of assault by the petitioners and they also made an aspersion to have heard that due to torture and assault, the deceased jumped into well, resulting in her death. In the postmortem report cause of death has been observed as asphyxia due to drowning. It has also come in evidence that the petitioners are evading investigation.

7. Considering the nature of allegations and the materials collected in course of investigation, as also the fact that the petitioners are evading, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

8. This anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ananda Sen, J.)

Kumar/Cp-03