

(2025:JHHC:18615)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 5563 of 2025

Pradeep Chik Baraik, aged about 32 years, son of Digamber Chik Baraik, R/o -Village -Patlo, Tangratoli, P.O.+P.S. - Senha, District -Lohardaga, Jharkhand.

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

...

Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ajeet Kr. Singh, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Saket Kumar, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 09.07.2025

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Sessions Trial No. 88 of 2024, arising out of Senha P.S. Case No.16 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 226 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under sections 302/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed the murder of Ishwar Chik Baraik. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and the P.W.5 has supported the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.03.2024, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 09 of the bail application. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view the overwhelming evidence that has come through the evidence of the five witnesses so far examined during the trial, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the

evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the overwhelming evidence that has come through the evidence of the five witnesses so far examined during the trial, and the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be admitted to bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Sonu-Gunjan/