IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.9845 of 2020

1. Kamdeo Yadav
2. Paro Devi
3. Govind Yadav … Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ⋯ Opposite Party

Coram: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY**

For the Petitioners : Mr. Ashwini Bhushan, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Azeemuddin, App. P.P.

02/15.12.2020 Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to remove the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown is over.

In view of personal undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

The petitioners have been made accused in connection with Karon P.S. Case No. 30 of 2018, corresponding to G.R. No.303 of 2018 registered under section 302/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner no.1 is the father-in-law, petitioner no.2 is the mother-in-law and petitioner no.3 is the *devar* of the deceased. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners have murdered the deceased. It is submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are false. It is next submitted that so far, four witnesses have been examined. It is further submitted that P.W.1 who is the brother of the deceased, has categorically stated that in her dying declaration, the deceased stated before the police that the petitioners have set the victim on fire which caused her death. It is next submitted that the petitioners were living separately from the deceased. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be released on bail.

Learned App. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submitted that P.W.-1 has categorically stated about the involvement of the petitioners in murdering of the deceased and there is overwhelming evidence in the record, hence, there is every chance of the petitioners absconding, if released on bail. Hence, the petitioners ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of the allegation against the petitioners of murdering the deceased, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the petitioners be admitted to bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above named petitioners is rejected.

Keeping in view the period of custody undergone by the petitioners and the serious nature of offences involved in this case, notwithstanding any order in administrative side of this court, the trial court is directed to take up the trial of the case expeditiously and to conclude the trial within six months from the date of receipt of this order by the trial court. It is made clear that the trial be conducted and the witnesses by examined by observing the precautions relating to COVID-19 pandemic.

Pappu/ **(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**