IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1463 of 2026
------

1. Chhabilal Murmu, aged about 33 years, son of Barka Murmu
2. Charan Hansda, aged about 22 years, son of Hopana Hansda
3. Babudhan Mareya, aged about 29 years, son of Musu Mareya
   All resident of Village Kusma Santhali, P.O. and P.S. Barhait
   District Sahibganj .... …. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Praful Jojo, A.P.P.

02/17.06.2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Jirwabari P.S. Case No. 202 of 2025, registered for the offence under Section 140(2) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sahibganj.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the names of the petitioners have come only on the confessional statement and apart from that, there is no allegation and the co-accused, Shiv Ram Murmu has also assaulted the deceased and thereafter, he has died. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and submits that in several paragraphs of the case diary, the prosecution’s case has been supported by the witnesses. In view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. In para 24 of the case diary, Sunil Hansda has admitted that Shiv Ram Murmu had informed him that he had killed the deceased- Jitendra Munda and dead body was required to be disposed of in forest. He has also stated that the petitioners have gone on the spot and have disposed of the dead body. The witnesses in paragraphs 25 and 26 of the case dairy, have also stated about the role of the other co-accused in the occurrence. In para 24 of the case diary, it has been clearly stated what role they have played in disposing of the body of the deceased.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners, is hereby, rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Anit
Uploaded
19.06.2026