

[2026:JHHC:11663]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.11357 of 2025

Amit Kumar, aged about 32 years, S/o Girivar Prasad, R/o Panchayat-Boriyadih, Village- Barmasia, Post- Barmasia, P.S.- Chandankiyari, Bokaro, Jharkhand, 828134.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Suraj Kishor Prasad, S/o. Brinda Prasad, R/o Village- Saltua, P.O+P.S. Chainpur, District- Palamu, Jharkhand.

.... Opposite Parties

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Diwakar Sippy, Advocate.
Mr. Prabaht Kumar, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Fahad Allam, Addl.P.P
For the O.P. No.2 : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Roy, Advocate.
Mr. Aditya Raman, Advocate.

Order No.04 Dated- 20-04-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Chandankiyari P.S. Case No.174 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 80, 3(5) of BNS.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner being the husband of Nilam Kumari has committed her dowry death. It is next submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the allegation against the petitioner is false. The petitioner has been in custody since 24.09.2025 and charge-sheet has also been submitted against the petitioner. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-22 of this bail application. It is next submitted that so far as two witnesses have been examined in this case and there is no ingredient found that the petitioner had ill-treated or harassed her wife immediately before her death. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned Addl.P.P. and learned counsel for the informant on the

other hand vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct and specific allegation that the petitioner has committed dowry death of the deceased. It is next submitted that the undisputed fact remains that the deceased died otherwise than in normal circumstances, within seven years of her marriage and there are documents in the record to show that the petitioner has taken money, time to time from the brother and father of the deceased and the evidence on record that has come during the trial is to the effect that the petitioner used to not to beat and harass the deceased of some days after receiving some money but again after some time he used to beat the deceased and harassing her to coerce her to meet his lawful demand and was thus treating her with cruelty. This fact has been intimated by the deceased to P.W.1 who is the brother of the deceased. It is next submitted that both the witnesses examined have supported the case of the prosecution. Hence, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

20/04/2026

Amar/-