IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 7202 of 2025
------

1. Pinki Kumari @ Pinki Devi, W/o Late Surendra Thakur
2. Mina Devi, W/o Manoj Thakur
3. Manoj Thakur, S/o Vishnu Dayal Thakur
   All are R/o Village :- Luhur, PO and PS- Barwadih, District- Latehar, Jharkhand.
4. Rohit Thakur, S/o Nandlal Thakur
5. Rahul Thakur, S/o Bajrang Thakur
6. Shankar Thakur, S/o Surendra Thakur
7. Jitendra Thakur, S/o Surendra Thakur
   All are R/o Village Rampur, PO and PS- Mahuadanr, District- Latehar, Jharkhand. .... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Mr. Prashant Kr. Rahul , Advocate
For the State : Mr. Arup Kr. Dey , A.P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Jai Shankar Tripathi, Advocate

02/01.05.2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Mahuadanr P.S. Case No.43 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 103(1), 238, 3(5) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and the case is pending in the court of learned S.D.J.M., Latehar.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the case and the entire allegation is concocted against the petitioners. By referring to the FIR, he submits that the petitioners have no role to play in the entire episode. There is no specific role against the petitioners of committing any offence of murder of the deceased. Only on suspicion, the petitioners have been implicated in the case.

4. He next submitted that initially U.D. Case No.02 /2025 was registered on the death of Surendra Thakur due to road accident in which report has already been submitted stating therein that there was road accident.

5. He has next submitted that after seven months, the present FIR has been registered on the suspicion. As such, on these grounds, the petitioners may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

6. Learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel for the informant have jointly opposed the prayer and they submit that the deceased was found lying on the road and according to them, these petitioners have murdered him and put the body on the road-side.

7. Looking to the contents of the FIR, it transpires that what role these petitioners played has not been disclosed. Initially U.D. Case No.02 /2025 was registered in which report has also been filed stating that it is a road accident. In the case diary, no witness has supported the allegations that there was ill-relationship with the petitioner no.1 who happened to be the wife of the deceased. Prima-facie, there was no occasion, cause, effect, motive, preparation against the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the above-named petitioners are directed to surrender before the learned Court within two weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and in the event of their arrest or surrender, they shall be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Twenty Five Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Latehar, in connection with Mahuadanr P.S. Case No.43 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Sandeep/

Uploaded/