IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3839 of 2026

Nanku Das son of Degan Das … … **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand … … **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Ms. Jyotsna Mahato, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sardhu Mahto, APP

02/**07.05.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 28.04.2025 in connection with Pachamba P.S. Case No. 54 of 2025, being S.T. No. 373 of 2025, for the offences registered under Sections 80(2), 89,3(5) of the B.N.S. 2023 and section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending in the court of learned ASJ, V, Giridih.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been made accused only because he happens to be the husband of the victim who is said to have expired on account of injuries suffered by her during the course of treatment on 30.04.2025. She has submitted that there is omnibus allegation against all the co-accused including the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner and other family members with regard to the demand of dowry and torture of the victim who was assaulted which ultimately became the cause of her death in her matrimonial home. The marriage was solemnized in the year 2020 and the victim died on 30.04.2025. It further appears that the trial is going on and 01 witness out of 07 has already been examined.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner in the FIR itself, who happens to be the husband of the victim who succumbed to death after being assaulted, this court is not inclined to enlarge the

petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is hereby rejected.

6. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court so that the trial be taken to its logical end.

7. The counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned District and to the Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

8. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 07.05.2026

Uploaded on 09.05.2026

Binit/