

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No.1084 of 2025

Vikram Dhapra, aged about 22 years, S/o Late Naresh Dhapra, R/o Club Ground, Purana Meena Bazar, K.K.N. Stadium South, Deoghar, P.O. & P.S. Deoghar, District Deoghar (Jharkhand).

... 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. Rahul Ranjan, Adv.
For the State : Mrs. Vandana Bharti, A.P.P.

Order No.03/Dated- 20.02.2026

I.A. No.1848 of 2026

1. Heard Mr. Rahul Ranjan, learned counsel for the appellant and learned A.P.P.
2. This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.
3. The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Sections 302, 201 and 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with fine of Rs.10,000/- for the offences under Section 302/120B of the I.P.C.
4. Submission has been advanced by learned counsel for the appellant that two of co-convicts have been granted bail by this Court in Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No.822 of 2025. It has further been submitted that the appellant has been convicted on the basis of circumstantial evidence.
5. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.
6. It appears that it was the appellant who had given threatening to the deceased prior to his death and it further appears that on the confession of the appellant, a knife was recovered and the weapon used in the murder appears to be a

sharp cutting weapon which corroborates the recovery on the confession of the appellant. So far as the case of the co-convicts who have been granted bail by this Court is concerned, their case is clearly distinguishable, considering the fact that their names had surfaced on account of the confessional statement rendered by the present appellant.

7. Regard being had to the strong circumstantial evidence emanating from the above, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. His prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

8. Accordingly, I.A. No.1848 of 2026 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Dated: 20th February, 2026

Sachin/