

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision (Filing) No. 12481 of 2025

Suresh Singh, aged about 58 years, son of Sri Sudarshan Singh, resident of Village-Raja Bangla, Lohardaga, P.O. & P.S.-Lohardaga, District-Lohardaga (Jharkhand).
.....
.....**Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand.
2. Awadh Kishor Sahu, son of Shivjhari Sah, resident of Village-Senha, P.O. & P.S.-Senha, District-Lohardaga.
.....
.....**Opp. Parties**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner : M/s. Nitish Krishna, Krishna Shankar, Advocates
For the O.P.-State : Ms. Shweta Singh, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No.2 : Mr. Lal Vikram Nath Shahdeo, Advocate
.....

02/Dated:-05.06.2025

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed to remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the registry.

I.A. No.6841 of 2025

2. Heard learned counsels for the parties.
3. The instant interlocutory application has been preferred by the petitioner before this Court for grant of bail during pendency of Cr. Revision No.12481 of 2025 which has been preferred against the judgment/order dated 11.07.2016 passed in Cr.Appeal No.89/2015 by the learned Sessions Judge, Lohardaga, whereby the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 30.07.2015 passed by learned S.D.J.M., Lohardaga in connection with Complaint Case No.123/2015 appertaining to its Trial No.435/2015, whereby the learned S.D.J.M., Lohardaga has convicted the accused/petitioner for the offence under Section 138 of the N.I. Act and sentenced him to undergo S.I. of two years along with a fine of Rs.10,00,000/-.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has wrongly been convicted in this case and the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence as alleged in the Complaint Case. He further submits that the dispute between the petitioner and the complainant has

already been resolved and settled which is evident from the compromise letter which has been annexed with the instant revision application dated 18.04.2025 in Complaint Case No.123/2015; as such, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail during pendency of this revision application. He submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by every condition as imposed by this court.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Having regard to the facts of the case and also looking to the allegation made against this petitioner coupled with the fact that compromise has been arrived at between the petitioner and the complainant; I am inclined to enlarge this petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Lohardaga in connection with Complaint Case No.123/2015.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

vikas/-