

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1198 of 2024

Shiv Shankar Karji @ Baaj	---	Appellant
Versus		
The State of Jharkhand.	---	Respondent

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

For the Appellant	:	Mr. Anjani Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P

I.A. No.6414 of 2025

06/10.07.2025 Heard Mr. Anjani Kumar, learned counsel appearing for the appellant and Mr. Pankaj Kumar, learned 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 punishable under Sections 395/34, 397/34, 376D/34, 377/34 and 412/34 I.P.C. and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with a fine of Rs.10,000/- for the offence under Section 376D/34 I.P.C.

It has been alleged that the accused persons had committed rape upon the victim.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that though the appellant was identified in the test identification parade but his role has been attributed towards snatching the mobile and purse of the victim and she has categorically stated that so long she was conscious, she was not subjected to rape by the present appellant. Learned counsel submits that though the prayer for bail of some of the co-convicts have been rejected by this Court, but the case of the appellant is on a different footing.

Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Learned P.P has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant and has submitted that the presence of the appellant was noted by the victim in the test identification parade and in fact from the house of the appellant the mobile and purse of the victim were recovered. The victim was subjected to gang-rape by several accused

persons and the presence of the appellant has been ascertained to the effect that he was the person who had snatched the mobile and purse of the victim.

Though the DNA sample of the victim does not match with the appellant, but regard being had to the presence and the recovery of mobile and purse from his house which further indicates that the appellant was also present at the place of occurrence, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. His prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

I.A. No.6414 of 2025 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Ambuj Nath, J.)

Shamim/