

(2026:JHHC:11822)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3227 of 2026

1. Md. Shamim Ray @ Samim Rai, aged about 33 years, S/o Nawab Ray, R/o Dhanghari, P.O. Baidhmar, Sector -9, P.S. -Harla, District -Bokaro, Jharkhand.
2. Khuda Nawaz Ray @ Kaifi Ray, aged about 24 years, S/o Sahabali Ray, R/o Dhanghari Basti, P.O. and P.S. -Harla, District -Bokaro, Jharkhand.

	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	...	Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners	: Mr. H.K. Shikarwar, Advocate
	: Mr. Anjani Nandan, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 22.04.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioners have moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Nawadih P.S. Case No.43 of 2025 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 451 of 2025, S.T. Case No. 297 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 140, 103, 238, 61(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

This is the second journey of the petitioners with the prayer for regular bail and earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioners was rejected vide order dated 05.02.2026 in B.A. No. 10313 of 2025. It is next submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the only fresh ground is that in the meanwhile, one witness who is the brother of the deceased has been examined as P.W.1 and he has supported the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is next submitted that no material evidence has come out from the confessional statement of the petitioners. It is further submitted that no D.N.A. examination has been conducted in respect of the skeleton of the deceased. It is next submitted that

because of enmity, this false case has been foisted. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the only fresh ground that the P.W.1 has been examined during the trial is not a mitigating factor rather it is an aggravating factor so far as the question of bail being granted is concerned; as the P.W.1 has supported the case of the prosecution, hence there is every chance of the petitioners absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. It is lastly submitted that the petitioners ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the fact that the P.W.1 has supported the case of the prosecution as well as the chance of the petitioners absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioners on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the above-named petitioners is rejected for the same reasons as mentioned in the order dated 05.02.2026 in B.A. No. 10313 of 2025.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

22.04.2026
Sonu/