**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

**B.A. No. 7784 of 2026**

Butu Manjhi @Butu Majhi, aged about 35 years, wife of Late Jadu Manhji @Jadu Majhi, resident of Burudih, P.O. Nimdih, P.S. Nimdih, District Seraikella Kharsawan. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opposite Party**

---

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Akhouri Awinash Kumar, Advocate
: Ms. Akhouri Ayushi Singh, Advocate
: Mr. Souma Ranjan Mukherjee, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha, APP

---

03/**19.08.2026** Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

**2.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.03.2024 in connection with S.T. No. 73 of 2024 arising out of Nimdih P.S. Case No. 12 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. No. 182 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under section 302 of Indian Penal Code, now pending in the Court of Learned Additional Sessions Judge, Chandil.

**3.** Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is facing charge under section 302 of Indian Penal Code and he happens to be the husband of the deceased. The learned counsel submits that it is alleged that by using an axe, the victim was assaulted by the petitioner. The axe has been recovered from the house, but the same was not sent for FSL examination.

**4.** The learned counsel for the petitioner has thereafter submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 14.03.2024. The charge was framed on 20.06.2024, but till date only one witness has been examined, that is the doctor, on 27th July, 2026. The learned counsel submits that custody of the petitioner and non-examination of the witnesses be taken into consideration for grant of bail at this stage.

**5.** Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that when the informant came to the place of occurrence, he found the victim in an injured condition. He submits

that the brother of the victim is the informant of the case and the brother of the petitioner and the brother of the victim (informant) together had taken the victim to the hospital and ultimately, she died in the hospital. He has submitted that the doctor has supported the prosecution case, inasmuch as, he has stated that the cause of injury was *"very forceful impact on head with heavy and blunt object"* and cause of death was *"Due to neurogenic and heavy hemorrhage leading to cardio respiratory failure"*.

**6.** In response, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that apart from the fact that the victim died in her matrimonial home, there is no other material connecting the petitioner with the alleged offence. The marriage had taken place around 15 years back and there are three children of the petitioner.

**7.** After hearing the learned counsels for the parties, this Court finds that in the First Information Report, there is an allegation that the petitioner used to assault the victim after consuming alcohol and the victim was found dead in her matrimonial home after having suffered grievous injuries on her head. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

**8.** Apparently, many material witnesses are yet to be examined before the learned court.

**9.** However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the learned court for examination.

**10.** Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution and Superintendent of Police of the concerned district to ensure compliance.

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

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

*Date of Order:19.08.2026*
*Pankaj*
*Date of Uploading:20.08.2026*