

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 5462 of 2025

Sachin Ray @ Sachin Kumar, Aged about 22 years, son fo
Ganesh Rai @ Ganesh Ray, resident of village- Barkakola, P.O.
& P.S.- Mohanpur, Dist.- Deoghar ... Petitioner
Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ankit Kumar , Adv.
For the State : Ms. Ruby Pandey, Addl. PP.

04 / 07.07.2025

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Mohanpur P. S. case no. 185 of 2024 instituted under Section 308 (4), 109, 3(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 27 of the Arms Act.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner attempted to murder the informant by firing upon his abdomen by gun shot. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false and though there is wound of both entry and exit of bullet but still the doctor has opined that both the entry and exit injury of bullet is simple in nature. It is next submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case hence, the petitioner may be admitted to regular bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the doctor has overlooked the eight component of grievous hurt, as mentioned in Section 320 of IPC, according to which, any hurt which endangers life, is to be treated as grievous hurt and entry and exit of bullet

through stomach of a person, endangers the life of a person, hence, in view of the direct and specific allegation against the petitioner as well his criminal antecedent of being involved in two other cases, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding, if released on bail and also there is chance of the petitioner tampering with the evidence. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail at this stage.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and his criminal antecedent as well as the chance of his tampering with the evidence and absconding, if released on bail, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be released on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY, J.)

Smita/-