

[2026:JHHC:16685]

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**B.A. No.5067 of 2026**

-----

Bijay Nayak @ Vijay Nayak, aged about 42 years S/O- Bandhan  
Nayak R/o- Village- Tumbagutu, Karam Toli, P.O. + P.S.-  
Namkum, Dist.- Ranchi                      ....      ....      ....      Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand                      ....      ....      ....      Opposite Party

-----

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

-----

For the Petitioner                      : Mr. Yasir Arafat, Advocate  
For the State                              : Mr. Prabir Kr. Chatterjee, Spl.P.P

-----

**Order No.02 Dated-10-06-2026**

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with S.T. No.260 of 2026 arising out of Namkum P.S. Case No.98 of 2023 registered under Section 302, 201 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the self-same prayer as earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was rejected on merit by this Court vide order dated 20.03.2026 in B.A. No.341 of 2026.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is that in the meanwhile, charge has been framed against the petitioner. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned Spl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the fact that charge has been framed against the petitioner is an aggravating factor and that cannot be a ground for reviewing the prayer for regular bail which has already been rejected on merit. 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, the mere fact that charge has been framed against the petitioner is not a sufficient ground to reconsider the prayer for bail of the petitioner which was already rejected on merit. Therefore, 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 at this stage for the same reasons as mentioned in the detailed order dated 20.03.2026 passed in B.A. No.341 of 2026.

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

Dated-10.06.2026-Animesh/