

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI  
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 958 of 2022

1. Munna Kureshi @ Munna Kureshi @ Munnu  
2. Kail Kureshi @ Afzal Kureshi --- --- Appellants

Versus

The State of Jharkhand --- --- Respondent  
---

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

For the Appellant: M/s. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate  
For the Resp.-State: M/s. Priya Shrestha, Special P.P.  
For the Informant: M/s. Niraj Kishore, Advocate  
---

**I.A. No. 5993 of 2025**

04 / 01.07.2025 Heard Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the appellants and Mrs. Priya Shrestha, learned Special P.P. assisted by Mr. Niraj Kishore, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Informant.

2. This application has been preferred by the appellants for grant of bail to them during the pendency of this appeal.

3. The appellants have been convicted for the offence under Section 302/34 of the I.P.C and have been sentenced to undergo imprisonment for life alongwith a fine of Rs. 25,000/- each.

4. It has been alleged that both the appellants had caught hold of the son of the deceased and the Appellant No. 2 had cut the neck of the deceased.

5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the case setup by the defence has not been properly appreciated by the learned Trial Court. It has been stated that on the purported confessional statement of the appellants, the weapon used in the commission of the murder was recovered from the house of the brother of the deceased. In fact, there was a fight between two brothers, which resulted in the death of Mohammad Aarjoo and since the day prior to the incident, an altercation had taken place on account of slaughtering of the cows in which the appellants were involved besides the house of the deceased, they have been falsely implicated in this case.

6. Learned Special P.P. as well as learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Informant have opposed the prayer for bail of the appellants.

2.

7. Regard being had to the fact that there are several eye witnesses to the occurrence and the specific role demarcated by the said witnesses of the commission of the murder by the appellants, we are not inclined to admit the appellants on bail. Accordingly, their prayer for bail is hereby rejected.

8. The aforesaid I.A. stands rejected.

**(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J)**

**(Ambuj Nath, J)**

Ranjeet-Nandini/