

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. A. (DB) No. 1106 of 2025

Nanigopal Gorai @ Aayan Gorai, aged about 64 years as per impugned
Judgement (72 years as per Aadhar Card), son of Late Kedar Gorai,
resident of Mouza Saluka, P.S.-Bindapathar, P.O. & District-Jamtara

... .. **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. Kaushik Sarkhel, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, Spl.P.P.
(through V.C.)

Order No. 03/ Dated: 17th October, 2025

I.A. No. 12387 of 2025

Heard Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel, learned counsel for the appellant and
learned Spl.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This interlocutory 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
302/34, 307/34, as well as 325/34, 323/34, 506/34 & 147/34 of I.P.C. and
has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for life along with a
fine of Rs. 10,000/- for the offence under Section 302/34 of I.P.C.

4. It has been alleged that the accused persons had committed assault
upon the mother-in-law as well as upon the husband of the informant,
which resulted in their becoming injured. Subsequently, the informant had
come to know that her father-in-law has been murdered and his body has
been thrown in the field.

5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the
appellant that so far as the appellant is concerned, he has been implicated
only on account of suspicion. It has been submitted that the appellant is
aged more than 70 years. Learned counsel submits that so far as P.W.-1 &
P.W.-2 are concerned, they claim themselves to be the eye-witnesses and
they have specifically stated that the assault was committed upon the
deceased Badal Gorai by Sunil Gorai and Dulal Gorai. Learned counsel
submits that P.W.-3 also claims himself to be an eye-witness to the

occurrence but his statement was never recorded by the police under Section 161 Cr.P.C. Learned counsel further submits that even if the evidence of P.W.-3 is taken into consideration the same would reveal that the allegations against the appellant are general and omnibus in nature.

6. Learned Spl.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

7. On consideration of the evidence of P.W. 1 & P.W.2 which has ruled out the role played by the appellant in committing assault upon the deceased Badal Gorai and the allegation against the appellant is general and omnibus in nature as per the evidence of P.W.-3, we are inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, during the pendency of this appeal, appellant, above named, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned District & Additional Sessions Judge-III, Jamtara, in S.T. No. 106 of 2023.

8. The aforesaid I.A. stands allowed and disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

17.10.2025
Pappu/Arpit