

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 1385 of 2025

Bikram Singh	...	Appellant
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	...	Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR RAI

For the Appellant	: Mr. Raja Ravi Shekhar Singh, Advocate
For the State	: A.P.P.

Order No. 05/ Dated: 14th July, 2026

I.A. No. 8208 of 2026

Heard Mr. Raja Ravi Shekhar Singh, 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 Section 452/302 of I.P.C. and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with a fine of Rs. 20,000/- for the offence under Section 302 I.P.C.

4. It has been alleged that the parents-in-law of the informant were murdered by the accused persons named in the First Information Report.

5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that four persons were sent up for trial, out of whom three have been acquitted by the learned Trial Court. It has been submitted that the person upon whose confession the *dauli*, said to be the murder weapon, was recovered, has also been acquitted. It has been submitted that the informant was given information about the incident by one Krishna Singh, but he has not been examined.

6. Learned counsel submits that the only basis for the conviction of the appellant appears to be the evidence of P.W.-8 and P.W.-9. Though P.W.-9 has not named the appellant as one of the persons who had dragged out the deceased, but so far as P.W.-8 is concerned, she has claimed to have identified the appellant at the time the accused persons were taking away the deceased, but at the same time, in the cross-examination, P.W.-8 has categorically stated that she has for the first time taken the name of the appellant in Court. Learned counsel further submits that during the entire

period after the commission of the offence, P.W.-8 did not take the name of the appellant, which has been admitted by her in her cross-examination.

7. Learned A.P.P has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

8. Regard being had to the fact that three of the co-accused persons have already been acquitted and, so far as the implication of the appellant is concerned, the same seems to be on the basis of P.W.-8, whose cross-examination seems to have diluted the case of the prosecution against the appellant with respect to his identification as the person who was instrumental in dragging out the parents-in-law of the informant and committing their murder, we are inclined to admit the appellant on bail.

9. Accordingly, during the pendency of this appeal, the appellant 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 Sessions Judge, Simdega in connection with Sessions Trial No. 183 of 2018 arising out of Bano P.S. Case No. 54 of 2018 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 386 of 2018.

10. I.A. No. 8208 of 2026 stands *allowed*.

(RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY, J.)

(ARUN KUMAR RAI, J.)

Dated: 14th July, 2026

Vedanti/-