

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 129 of 2026

Baleshwar Oraon, aged about 57 years, son of Chamu Oraon, resident of Village – Kalyanpur, P.O. and P.S. – Piparwar, District – Chatra (Jharkhand).

..... Appellant

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant : Mr. Sahil, Advocate.
For the State : Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, Spl.P.P.

Order No. 04/Dated: 18th March, 2026

1. Heard Mr. Sahil, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. learned A.P.P.
2. This appeal is directed against the order dated 15.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Chatra in A.B.P. No. 1631/2025 in connection with Piparwar P.S. Case No. 36/2019, whereby and whereunder, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant has been rejected.
3. It has been alleged that an extremist organization was involved in collection of levy from the D.O. holder and coal traders.
4. Prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant was earlier rejected in A.B.A. No. 3075 of 2020 and A.B.A. No. 7285 of 2021.
5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that on account of the antecedent of the appellant, prayer for bail of the appellant was earlier rejected, but the appellant was acquitted in the said case being S.T. No. 07 of 2004.
6. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that several of co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail in A.B.A. No. 1959/2020, A.B.A. No. 9237/2019 and A.B.A. No. 8890/2019.

7. Learned Spl.P.P has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

8. It appears that though the appellant is claiming parity with respect to those co-accused persons, who have been granted anticipatory bail, but it seems that those grounds were available to the appellant prior to consideration of his anticipatory bail application being A.B.A. No. 3075 of 2020 on 22.07.2021 itself. So far as the acquittal in S.T. No. 07 of 2004 is concerned, the same was brought to the notice of learned Single Judge in A.B.A. No. 7285 of 2021 and on consideration of the said fact, prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant was once again rejected.

9. In view of the aforesaid and considering the serious nature of allegation against the appellant, we are not inclined to entertain this appeal, which accordingly stand dismissed.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

March 18, 2026

Sunil/

Uploaded on 20.03.2026