

(2026:JHHC:13879)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3654 of 2026

Deepak Verma @ Deepak Kumar Verma, aged about 47 years,
s/o Madan Lal Verma, r/o Kola Kusuma, K.G. Ashram, P.O.,
P.S. & Dist.-Dhanbad ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shailesh Kr. Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Suraj Deo Munda, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 08.05.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with S.T. No. 213 of 2026 arising out of Dhanbad P.S. Case No.441 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under sections 103(1)/61(2)/3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023 and under Section 27 of Arms Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 10.03.2026 in B.A. No. 1351 of 2026. It is further submitted that the fresh ground is that in the meanwhile charge has been framed but no witnesses has been examined in this case. It is then submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and the petitioner has been in custody for some more time. It is also submitted that the co-accused persons have already been admitted to bail. 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 the allegation of the co-accused persons who have been admitted to bail stands on a different footing than this petitioner and the mere fact that charge has been framed against the petitioner is at best an aggravating factor but

not a mitigating factor for which the petitioner can be release on bail; as his prayer for bail has earlier been rejected on merit. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that merely because the charge has been framed against the petitioner, the same is not a sufficient ground to reconsider the prayer for bail which has already been rejected on merit. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected for the same reasons as mentioned in the order dated 10.03.2026 in B.A. No. 1351 of 2026.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

08.05.2026
Gunjan-