

(2026:JHHC:17985)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3684 of 2026

Vijay Das, son of late Triveni Das, aged about 25 years,
resident of Mahulsai, Madkamhatu, P.O.-Chaibasa, P.S.-
Muffasil Chaibasa, Dist.-West Singhbhum, Jharkhand

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

...

Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Ms. Monalisa Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sanat Kr. Jha, Addl. P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Vishal Kr. Tiwary, Advocate
: Mr. Imran Beig, Advocate

Order No.03 Dated- 19.06.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with S.T. No. 349 of 2025 arising out of Chaibasa Sadar P.S. Case No.56 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 103(1)/303(2)/3(5) 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 in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused persons has committed the murder of Sumit Singh Yadav. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and though the petitioner is not named in the FIR but the informant identified the petitioner in the T.I. Parade. It is next submitted that co-accused Saurav Raj has been admitted to bail by a coordinate Bench of this Court. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. and the learned counsel for the informant on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the bail of the co-accused-Ravi Toppo has already been rejected. It is next submitted by the learned Addl. P.P. and the learned counsel for the informant that since the petitioner

has been identified in the T.I. Parade and in view of the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with 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 chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the abovenamed petitioner be admitted to bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the abovenamed petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

19.06.2026
Gunjan-