

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1363 of 2023

Jaiveer Oraon	----	---	Appellant
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	---	---	Respondent

CORAM: **Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rongon Mukhopadhyay**
Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ambuj Nath

For the Appellant:	Mr. Shashank Shekhar Prasad., Advocate
For the Resp.-State:	Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, Special P.P.

07 / 15.04.2025 The explanation submitted by the learned Registrar General of this Court pursuant to the order dated 02.04.2025 is accepted.

I.A. No. 3563 of 2025

Heard Mr. Shashank Shekhar Prasad, learned counsel for the appellant and Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, learned Special P.P.

2. The appellant has been convicted for the offences punishable under Section 302/149, 307/149, 452/149 and 148 of the I.P.C. and Section 27 of the Arms Act and the maximum sentence imposed upon him is rigorous imprisonment for life along with a fine of Rs. 10,000/- for the offences punishable under Section 302/149 of the I.P.C.

3. It has been alleged that the Informant had gone to irrigate his field, where some miscreants started firing upon him, due to which, he suffered injury on his left palm. When he reached his house, his son disclosed that some persons had come in his house and they have killed the wife of the informant namely, Shanti Devi.

4. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that though PW1, PW2 and PW3 claim themselves to be eye witnesses to the occurrence, but their cross-examination reveals otherwise. He has also referred to the evidence of the Investigating Officer who has been examined as PW7 to the effect that PW1, PW2 and PW3 appears to be the eyewitnesses, but they have not stated anything before the Investigating Officer about having seen the present appellant chasing the informant in the field.

5. Learned Special P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

6. From perusal of the evidence of PW1, PW2 and PW3, there appears to be strong circumstance about the appellant who was also involved in firing at the informant as well as taking part in the murder of the wife of the informant.

2.

7. Regard being had to the above, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, his prayer for bail stands rejected.

8. The aforesaid I.A. stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J)

(Ambuj Nath, J)

Ranjeet-Nandini/