

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

**Cr. A (D.B.) No. 866 of 2025**

-----

1. Deviran Bibi, aged about 68 years W/o Sultan Mian  
2. Sultan Mian aged about 74 years, S/o Late Thakuri Mian  
Both R/o Village-Dewatand, P.O. + P.S.-Bengabad, District-Giridih  
... .. Appellants

**Versus**

The State of Jharkhand ... .. Respondent

-----

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

-----

For the Appellants : Mr. Arwind Kumar, Advocate  
For the Respondent : Mr. Shailesh Kr. Sinha, A.P.P.  
For the Informant : Mr. Sajjad Ansari, Advocate

-----

**03/Dated: 16<sup>th</sup> September, 2025**

**I.A. No.9998 of 2025**

1. Heard Mr. Arwind Kumar, learned counsel for the appellants and Mr. Shailes Kumar Sinha, learned A.P.P. for the State assisted by Mr. Sajid Ansari, learned counsel for the informant.
2. This application has been preferred by the appellants for grant of bail to them during pendency of this appeal.
3. The appellant has been convicted for the offence under section 302/34 of Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo life imprisonment along with a fine of Rs.10,000/-.
4. It has been alleged that the grandson of the informant was playing with the grandson of the appellants but subsequently he could not be found. On a search conducted, the dead body of the grandson of the informant was found lying in the old house of Manir Mian.
5. Submission has been advanced by learned counsel for the appellants that the appellants have been implicated only on account of suspicion.
6. It has further been submitted that though P.W.3 has stated that while passing near the house of Manir Mian, he heard the wailing of a child but he does not say as to whether he had taken any steps to discover the reason or inform the parents of the child.
7. Learned counsel adds that the appellant is in custody since long and only on account of fact that the appellant and her husband were seen coming from the old house of Manir Mian, they have been convicted.

8. Learned counsel for the informant has submitted that cause of death was asphyxia due to strangulation. It has been submitted that the appellants in their confessional statement, have admitted to have strangled the grandson of the informant, which has been corroborated in the post-mortem report.
9. Learned counsel has also referred to the evidence of P.W.3, who according to him is an eye-witness to the incident.
10. The reaction of the P.W.3 in coming to know about some mishap, which is going on inside the old house of Manir Mian seems to negate his status as an eye-witness to the incident.
11. So far as the confessional statement is concerned, the same was before the police, which does not have, in the fact and circumstances of the case, any evidentiary value. The appellants have been implicated only on suspicion of having been seen coming from the old house of Manir Mian and subsequent thereto, the dead body of the grandson of the informant was recovered .
12. Regard being had to the above, we are inclined to admit the appellants on bail.
13. Accordingly, during pendency of this appeal, the appellants are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rs. Ten Thousand/-) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Giridih in connection with S.T. Case No.178 of 2020 arising out of Bengabad P.S. Case No.67 of 2020.
14. I.A. No.9998 of 2025 stands disposed of.

**(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)**

**(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)**