

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 6154 of 2020

Md. Istekhar Ansari @ Iftekhar Alam Petitioner
 Versus
 The State of Jharkhand Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vijay Kumar Roy, Advocate
 For the Opp. Party : Mr. Ashok Singh, A.P.P.

Through Video Conferencing

5/31.05.2021

1. Heard Mr. Vijay Kumar Roy, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner.
2. Heard Mr. Ashok Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Tandwa P.S. Case No. 143 of 2018, corresponding to G.R. No. 1424 of 2018, S.T. No. 333 of 2018, for the offence alleged under Section 304(B)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-III, Chatra.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had earlier moved before this court for grant of bail in B.A. No. 1023 of 2019 which was dismissed as withdrawn on 02.07.2019. Thereafter the petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the husband of the deceased and the deceased was his wife who had committed suicide. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that other family members of the petitioner have been granted anticipatory bail and they have also expressed their willingness to keep Rs. 50,000/-jointly in the Fixed Deposit in the name of the son of the deceased who was now in the custody of his parental grandfather. Learned counsel further

submits that charge has been framed on 21.01.2019 and the last witness was examined on 08.08.2019 and two witnesses have been examined out of ten witnesses.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State Mr. Ashok Singh opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there are direct allegations against the petitioner and the case is under Section 304B/34 of the Indian Penal Code.
6. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of this case and the fact that there is direct allegation against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.
7. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Binit/