

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 1673 of 2026

Vikash Thakur @ Bikash Thakur, son of Sunil Thakur
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kumar Harsh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, APP

- 08/10.04.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 17.04.2025 in connection with S.T. Case No. 152 of 2025 arising out of Saraiyahat P.S. Case No. 53 of 2025, registered under Sections 80(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Dumka.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is the husband of the victim and he is in custody since 17.04.2025. He has further submitted that as per the FSL report, no poison etc. was found in the viscera report. This has been mentioned in the counter-affidavit itself.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that in the post-mortem report, no external injury has been mentioned. However, during the course of hearing it transpired that the post-mortem report is silent with respect to external injury.
5. The learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the victim died natural death.
6. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the victim died unnatural death in her matrimonial home within 9 months of marriage. He submits that the victim was only 19 years of age.
7. The learned counsel for the State has further submitted that the victim died due to strangulation.
8. This Court finds it surprising that as mentioned in the impugned

order, the investigating officer of the case and the doctor have not been cited as witness. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State is unable to explain.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the victim aged 19 years having suffered unnatural death in her matrimonial home within 9 months of marriage, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

10. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution and Superintendent of Police of the concerned District showing the concern of this Court as to why the investigating officer and the doctor have not been shown as charge-sheeted witness in the case.

11. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through "FAX/email".

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:10.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:14.04.2026