

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 2814 of 2026

Shyamlal Ganjhu, son of Chaman Ganjhu
... .. Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mrs. Jasvindar Mazumdar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Ms. Kumari Rashmi, APP

03/30.04.2026

Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.01.2026 in connection with Pathalgadda P.S. Case No. 62 of 2025, registered under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 118(1), 117(2), 103(1), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 3/4 of Prevention of Witch Craft (Daain) Practices Act, now pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Chatra.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report although he is alleged to be the driver of the tractor. It has been alleged that the petitioner was the driver of the tractor which moved backward to kill the child.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report and even the petitioner has not been put on Test Identification Parade.
5. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the entire narrative in the First Information Report reveals that on 27.12.2025, the wife of the informant was branded as witchcraft practitioner and her child was snatched away and assaulted and the child was put behind the tractor and the driver was asked to move backward pursuant to which the driver moved backward. She submits that the entire incident was witnesses by the eye-witnesses including the informant of the case and therefore, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.
6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and upon going

through the case-diary which reveals that there are eye-witnesses to the occurrence and considering the fact that there is direct allegation against the petitioner who was the driver of the alleged vehicle, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:30.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:04.05.2026