

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1294 of 2025

.....

Govind Bauri	---	Appellant
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand.	---	Respondent

CORAM: **Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rongon Mukhopadhyay**
 Hon'ble Mr. Justice Pradeep Kumar Srivastava

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Amit Kr. Tiwari, Advocate
For the Respondent	:	A.P.P.

I.A. No.14809 of 2025

10/19.02.2026 Heard Mr. Amit Kr. Tiwari, learned counsel appearing for the appellant and learned A.P.P.

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

The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Sections 302/34 and 201/34 of IPC and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life along with a fine of Rs.25,000/- for the offence under Section 302/34 of IPC.

Submission has been advanced by learned counsel for the appellant that the entire case of the prosecution hinges upon the evidence of P.W.8. It has been submitted that P.W.8 is not an eye-witness to the occurrence. It has further been submitted that it is said that the deceased was called by the appellant over phone but the CDR has not been produced by the prosecution. Learned counsel also adds that there is no recovery of any incriminating articles from the conscious possession of the appellant and that one of the co-accused person namely Bittu Kumar though was not named in the First Information Report but his name has subsequently transpired, has been granted bail by this Court in Cr. Appeal (DB) No.813 of 2025.

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

It appears that the case of Bittu Kumar is distinguishable from the case of the present appellant to the effect that the said Bittu Kumar was

not named in the First Information Report and so far as the appellant is concerned, P.W.8 has categorically stated about the deceased having been last seen with the appellant and in fact as it appears from the evidence of P.W.6 the investigating officer that on the disclosure made by this appellant as well as the co-convict, the weapon of assault was recovered.

Regard being had to the aforesaid, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellant is hereby rejected.

I.A. No. 14809 of 2025 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)