

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 783 of 2019

S. Srinivas Rao **Appellant**
Versus
State of Jharkhand **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMBUJ NATH

For the Appellant : Mr. Jitendra S. Singh, Advocate
Mr. Praveen Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vineet Kr. Vashistha, A.P.P.

I.A. No. 871 of 2022

03/09.06.2022 Heard Mr. Jitendra S. Singh, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Vineet Kr. Vashistha, learned A.P.P. for the State.

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

The appellant has been convicted for the offence u/s 304-B of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life.

It has been alleged that the wife of the appellant was done to death on account of non-fulfillment of the demand of dowry.

It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellant that the marks of injury found on the body of the deceased as per the postmortem report has been suitably explained by virtue of the evidence of P.W.1 and the medical prescription which has been exhibited as Exhibit-A. It has further been submitted while referring to the examination-in-chief of P.W.2 that no demand of dowry was ever made from the side of the appellant. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the appellant has remained in custody for more than five years.

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

It appears from the postmortem report that several injuries were found on the person of the deceased and the Doctor had opined that the cause of death may or may not be

suicidal hanging. Certain articles were also seized at the place of occurrence.

Although, learned counsel for the appellant has tried to focus on the fact that the deceased had sustained some injuries on account of a road accident two days prior to her death but in view of the overwhelming ocular evidence as well as the postmortem report, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellant is hereby rejected.

I.A. No. 871 of 2022 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Ambuj Nath, J.)