

ITEM NO.33

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CRIMINAL) Diary No(s). 7140/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 22-07-2021 in CRADB No. 165/2017 passed by the High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi]

RAM PRASAD SAO

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF JHARKHAND

Respondent(s)

IA No. 40623/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

Date : 13-02-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Kedar Nath Tripathy, AOR
Mr. Aditya Narayan Tripathy, Adv.
Ms. Pallavi Sahu, Adv.
Mr. Sahitya Srivastava, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. This petition arises from the judgment and order passed by the High Court of Jharkhand dated 22.07.2021 in Criminal Appeal (DB) No.165/2017 by which the appeal preferred by the petitioner against the judgment and order of conviction passed by the Trial Court came to be dismissed.
3. It appears from the materials on record that the

petitioner was put to trial in Sessions Case No.423/2008 for the offence punishable under Sections 498A, 302 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code (for short, "the IPC").

4. It appears that in all, 6 accused persons were put to trial, including the petitioner herein.

5. The other co-accused came to be acquitted by the Trial Court whereas the present petitioner was held guilty of the offence of double murder.

6. One of the deceased, namely, Kalawati Devi happen to be the wife of the present petitioner. The dead bodies of two deceased persons, namely, Arjun Ravidas and Kalawati Devi were recovered from the very house of the present petitioner.

7. The entire case of the prosecution hinges on circumstantial evidence.

8. We are of of the view that no error, not to speak of any error of law could be said to have been committed by the High Court in passing the impugned judgment and order.

9. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner brought to our notice that the petitioner is undergoing life imprisonment past almost 18 years.

10. This being a case of double murder, we do not know whether the policy of the State Government permits remission of sentence of life imprisonment or not. However, we keep it open for the petitioner to prefer an appropriate representation addressed before the competent authority of the State Government praying for remission of sentence.

11. If any such representation is preferred, the competent

authority shall look into the same in accordance with law, keeping in mind the State Policy in so far as remission is concerned and take appropriate decision on the same.

12. With the aforesaid, the Special Leave Petition stand disposed of.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)