

**(2026:JHHC:13043)**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**B. A. No. 3719 of 2026**

Bhola Hembram @ Bhola Honhaga, aged about 29 years, son of  
Ajit Hembrom @ Ajit Honhaga, resident of Baregora, Parsudih PO  
& PS – Parsudih, Town – Jamshedpur, District – East Singhbhum,  
Jharkhand.

... ..**Petitioner**

**Versus**

The State of Jharkhand.

... ..**Opp. Party**

-----

|                    |                              |
|--------------------|------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner | : Mr. Yashvardhan, Advocate  |
| For the State      | : Mr. Fahad Allam, Spl. P.P. |

-----

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY**

-----

**Order No:- 03, Dated:- 04<sup>th</sup> May, 2026**

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved before this Court for grant of bail in connection with Parsudih P.S. Case No. 151 of 2024, arising out of S.T. Case No. 154 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under sections 103(1), 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023, along with Sections 27 of the Arms Act, later on Section 25(1-B)(a), 26, 35 of the Arms Act and Section 331(7) of the B.N.S.

It is the third journey of the petitioner with the prayer for grant of regular bail.

Earlier, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of regular bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 02.07.2025 passed by this Court in B.A. No. 5297 of 2025 and again his prayer for regular bail was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 17.10.2025 passed in B.A. No. 9544 of 2025.

It is next submitted that the fresh ground for grant of regular bail of the petitioner is that the petitioner has been in custody for some more time and no witnesses have been examined. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Spl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the fact that the

petitioner has been in custody for some more time, is not a sufficient ground to reconsider the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail which was already rejected earlier on merit. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the fact that the prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit, this Court is of the view that the mere fact that the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time is not a sufficient ground to reconsider the prayer of the petitioner for bail, which has already been rejected on merit.

Accordingly, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of bail is *rejected* for the same reasons as mentioned in order dated 02.07.2025 passed by this Court in B.A. No. 5297 of 2025.

**(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**

Dated – 04.05.2026  
Aditi