

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**B.A. No. 8523 of 2026**

Kedar Nath Murmu S/o Bolai Murmu, aged about 35 years, residents  
of Village-Porsa, P.O. Butgora, P.S.-Potka, District-East Singhbhum  
... .. **Petitioner**  
Versus  
The State of Jharkhand ... .. **Opp. Party**

---  
**CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**  
---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Jitesh Kumar, Advocate  
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Saket Kumar, A.P.P.  
---

- 03/16.09.2026                      Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2.        Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with S.T. Case No. 212 of 2025, arising out of Potka P.S. Case No. 88 of 2024, G.R. No. 531 of 2025, for the offences registered under Sections 103(1) & 3(7) of the B.N.S. 2023, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-V, Jamshedpur.
3.        Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 10.01.2025 in connection with death of his wife in matrimonial home. He submits that bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected in B.A. No. 7669 of 2025 vide order dated 04.11.2025. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail primarily on the ground that witnesses who have been examined so far have not fully supported the prosecution case though none of them have been declared hostile. The learned counsel submits that out of 12 witnesses, 08 witnesses have been examined.
4.        The learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail at this stage.
5.        After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier on merit and trial is at the advance stage, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

7. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the to the Director, Prosecution, and to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned District to ensure compliance.

8. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

Dated: 16.09.2026

Uploaded on 17.09.2026

Binit/