

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.2167 of 2026

Vijay Kumar Singh, aged about 65 years, S/o Sri Jagat Singh, R/o At – Nimiya,
P.O.+P.S.- Patan, District – Palamau, Jharkhand.

.... **Petitioner(s)/Applicant(s)**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

.... **Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Petitioner(s)/Applicant(s) : Mr. Jitendra Shankar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Sheo Kr. Singh, Adv.

For the State

: Mr. Anup Pawan Topno, A.P.P.

02/Dated: 17th April, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned counsel for the State.
2. The applicant who is in custody since 08.07.2025 has approached this Court for grant of regular bail in connection with Patan P.S. Case No.40 of 2025 corresponding to G.R. Case No.1881 of 2025, S.T. No.73 of 2026, registered for the offence under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 109, 352, 351(2), 3(5) of the BNS and under Section 27 of the Arms Act, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Palamau.
3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the applicant(s) that complete set of FIR along with its enclosure have been annexed with this bail application and there is no suppression on his/her part.
4. Innocence has been claimed by the learned counsel for the applicant and undertaking has been given for participation in the trial. It has been submitted by referring the FIR that there is specific allegation against two persons namely Ranjit Kr. Singh @ Chintu Singh and Vijay Kumar Singh making allegation of gunshot firing. The injury report supports the allegation. It has further been submitted that the wife has claimed herself to be the eye witness and accordingly the FIR has been lodged, but the other co-accused namely Ranjit Kr. Singh @ Chintu Singh has been granted bail relying upon the statement given to the police by the injured/victim that it was the applicant who has made the gunshot.
5. It has further been submitted that it is not the case of prosecution that is repeated firing rather it is two separate firing by two different persons and it is the allegation. On the basis of parity, prayer for bail has been made.

6. Learned counsel for the State and the informant have opposed the prayer for bail and it has been submitted that there is gunshot injury and the injured witness has clearly attributed the gunshot injury to the present applicant.

7. Considering the above material available on record, I am not inclined to enlarge the applicant on bail. Accordingly, the present bail application stands rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Dated: 17th April, 2026
Amar/-
Uploaded on 18.04.2026