

(2026:JHHC:12469)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B. A. No. 3519 of 2026

1. Budhram Soy, aged about 24 years, s/o Pator Soy, resident of village Mailepi, PO - Lanjo, PS - Sonua, District - West Singhbhum.
2. Dango Bodra @ Deben Bodra, aged about 25 years, s/o Pagu Bodra, resident of village - Mailepi, PO - Lanjo, PS - Sonua, District- West Singhbhum. **... ..Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand.

... ..Opp. Party

For the Petitioner : Mr. Aniket Ranjan, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Saket Kumar, Addl. P.P.
For the Opp. P. No. 2: Ms. Vani Kumari, Advocate

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

Order No:- 04, Dated:- 28th April, 2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioners have moved before this Court for grant of bail in connection with Sonua P.S. Case No. 19 of 2023, arising out of G.R. Case No. 63 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under sections 147, 149, 302, 120B, 506 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegations against the petitioners are that the petitioners were the members of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object of the assembly, committed double murder of Mangta Gagrai and Moika Gagrai @ Budhram Gagrai. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are all false. It is further submitted that five co-accused persons have been acquitted after their separate trial, in connection with the same case. It is then submitted that the petitioners have been in custody since 10.11.2025, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 01 of the bail application. It is further submitted that the petitioners undertake to cooperate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer of bail of the petitioners and submits that keeping in view the direct allegation and serious nature against the petitioners of committing double murder of Mangta Gagrai and Moika Gagrai @ Budhram Gagrai, there is every chance of the petitioners absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners ought not be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners and the chance of the petitioners absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners, is *rejected* at this stage.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)