

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 1498 of 2025

Lakhiram Munda @ Narsingh Munda @ Miru Munda
... .. **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Respondent**

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

For the Appellant : Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, A.P.P.

I.A. No. 8708 of 2026

07/14.08.2026 Heard Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel for
the appellant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

This interlocutory application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

The appellant has been convicted for the offences u/s 302 and 201 of the Indian Penal Code and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for life along with a fine of Rs. 20,000/- for the offence u/s 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

It has been alleged that the daughter of the informant was married with the appellant and on 02.07.2022 while grazing animals the informant had heard a cry of alarm and when he reached the house, he found his daughter being assaulted by the appellant with a dagger and his daughter lying in a pool of blood. It has further been alleged that when the appellant saw the informant and other persons coming, he had fled away with the dagger from the place of occurrence. Subsequently in course of treatment the daughter of the informant has died.

Submission has been advanced by Mrs. Snehlika Bhagat, learned counsel for the appellant that though the informant has stated about seeing the appellant committing the assault upon his daughter but the same has been diluted in his evidence as P.W.5, from which, it appears that this witness has partly turned hostile. Learned counsel for

the appellant further submits that it is the case of the prosecution that recovery of a Danda and Tona were made on the confessional statement of the appellant but the same also gets diluted in view of the evidence of P.W.1 who also claims himself to be an eyewitness and who has stated that the *Katari* was recovered by the Police from the place of occurrence. Learned counsel submits that the FSL report does not support the case of the prosecution since no DNA profile could be generated from the blood stained *Ganji* which was recovered from the personal possession of the appellant. It has been submitted that the appellant is in custody for more than four years.

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

The evidence of the Investigating Officer reveals about the recovery of a Danda and a Tona on the confessional statement of the appellant and the FSL report reveals that the DNA profile generated from the same contains the blood of a human female source of origin. Moreover, the postmortem report further strengthens the case of the prosecution with respect to the manner of assault committed upon the deceased. Though there is some dilution with respect to the evidence of P.W.5 but at the same time he has mentioned that he had seen the incident from the courtyard.

On consideration of the surrounding circumstances of the case as depicted above, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. His prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

I.A. No. 8708 of 2026 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)