

(2026:JHHC:11733)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3238 of 2026

Sunil Rajak @ Sunil Dhoni, aged about 43 years, son of
Kailash Rajak @ Kailash Dhobi, resident of Village-Railway
Colony Upar Tola Near Hanuman Temple, P.O.-Jainagar,
P.S.-Patratu, Dist.-Ramgarh ... Petitioner
Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Hemant Kr. Shikarwar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 22.04.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No.03 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 190/ 191(2)/ 191(3)/ 332(a)/109/103(1)/61(2)/111(2)(b) of the B.N.S., 2023 and under Section 27 of Arms Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was member of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of the common objection of the assembly and in criminal conspiracy with each other has committed the murder of Bharat Pandey @ Bharat Singh and Deepak Saw @ Dulla, by firing upon them. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and the petitioner has not been put on T.I. Parade, though as per the FIR, the paternal aunt of Sanoj Singh has seen the assailants going away from the place of occurrence; after the occurrence. It is next submitted that the charge sheet has already been submitted in this case. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of surmises and presumptions. It is then submitted that the deceased was having several criminal antecedents including murder of Amit Buxi and Roushan Saw. It is further submitted that no incrimination article

has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. It is next submitted that no complaint or FIR has been registered for the alleged threatening given by the Vikas Tiwary and Nishi Pandey to the deceased and their family members. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 23.09.2025, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 10 of the bail application. It is also submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the trial of the case and further undertakes that he will not annoy or disturb the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the co-accused person with similar allegation has already been admitted to bail by this Court vide order dated 20.06.2025 in B.A. No.4900 of 2025. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail.

Considering the submissions of the counsels and the fact as discussed above, I am inclined to enlarge the abovenamed petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M., Palamau at Daltonganj, in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No.03 of 2025 with the condition that the petitioner will cooperate with the trial of the case and will furnish his mobile number and a copy of his Aadhar Card in the court below with the undertaking that he will not change his mobile number during the trial of the case, with further condition that he will not annoy or disturb the witnesses of the case in any manner during the trial of the case.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)