# IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
## B.A. No.9371 of 2026

---

Sunita Devi, aged about 36 years, widow of Late Ranjit Lohra, resident of Village Kachhupani, P.O. and P.S. Bolba, District Simdega, Jharkhand.

.... .... …. Petitioner

*Versus*

The State of Jharkhand .... .... .... Opposite Party

---

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

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Zaid Ahmed, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bishambhar Shastri, Addl.P.P

---

**Order No.02 Dated:-07-10-2026**

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with S.T. Case No. 48 of 2025 arising out of Bolba P.S. Case No. 10 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302/201 of the Indian Penal Code.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was rejected on merit by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 09.10.2025 passed in B.A. No. 6437 of 2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only fresh ground is that thereafter, PW-7 to 11 have been examined and except PW-11, rest of the witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State on the other hand opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that keeping in view the overwhelming evidence that has come through the

witnesses who have been examined as PW-1 to PW-10, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the chance of her absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail as also the fact that earlier the prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit and the evidence that has already come on record against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to admit the above named petitioner on bail.

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

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

Dated:-07.10.2026
Saroj/