

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B. A. No. 6144 of 2021

Reeta Gon @ Reeta Devi ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opposite Party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Gautam Kumar ,Adv.
For the State : Mr. Bishambhar Shastri ,Addl. P.P.

02/07.09.2021

Heard the parties through Video Conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner personally undertakes to remove the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter within two weeks after the lockdown is over.

In view of the personal undertaking given by learned counsel for the petitioner the defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending her arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Pakur (T) P.S. Case No. 60 of 2021 registered under Sections 302/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused persons, has committed the murder of the father of the informant. It is then submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the post mortem report does not support the contention of the informant who is an eye witness to the occurrence that the petitioner along with the others thrashed the head of the deceased on the wall. It is next submitted that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation of the case hence, the petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

The learned Addl. PP vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner that the petitioner in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused persons, committed murder of the father of the informant and the informant himself is the eye witness to the occurrence and in the FIR itself the informant has vividly stated the specific role played by the petitioner in commission of murder of his father, hence, in view of serious allegation against the petitioner, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during investigation of the case to find out the details of the case, hence the petitioner ought not be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious allegations against the petitioner and the requirement of his custodial interrogation during investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case, where the privilege of anticipatory bail be given to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY, J.)

Smita/-