

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 6958 of 2025

1. Nitu Kumari, aged about 24 years, wife of Kartik Chandra Pramanik, daughter of Puran Chandra Pramanik, resident of Krishna Nagar, Harmu, P.S. & P.O. Sukhdeo Nagar, District- Ranchi- 834005
 2. Purn Chandra Pramanik, aged about 42 years, son of Haraghan Pramanik, resident of Ganga Nagar Road no.7, Harmu, P.S. & P.O. Harmu, District- Ranchi-834002
- ... Petitioners**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Mr. Anurag Choudhary, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bishambhar Shastri, A.P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Shantanu Singh, Advocate

05/22.04.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Ichagarh P.S. Case No.35 of 2025 dated 09.04.2025, registered for the offence under Sections 190, 191(2), 191(3), 118(2), 109 and 103(1) of the BNS, pending in the Court of the learned A.C.J.M., Chandil.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 is the daughter-in-law of the deceased and petitioner no.2 is the father of petitioner no.1. He further submits that false allegations are made against the petitioners. He submits that the petitioners are innocent and in spite of that the allegations are made that petitioner no.1 has called petitioner no.2, who has come on spot with other persons and assaulted the father-in-law of petitioner no.1 and pursuant to that he died. He also submits that these allegations are false as petitioner no.1 has also received injury.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State and informant jointly opposed the prayer and submit that there is direct allegation against these petitioners

of instigating and pursuant to that mercilessly the deceased has been beaten and thereafter he died.

5. Looking into the contents of the FIR, it transpires that there is direct allegation against these petitioners of instigating and assault upon the deceased and pursuant to that he died.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and, as such, the prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 22nd April, 2026
Ajay/