

(2026:JHHC:17326)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B. A. No. 5314 of 2026

Fuldev Singh, aged about 70 years, son of late Guhi Singh, resident of village – Chunglo, PO – Gadi Islampur, PS – Giridih (M), District - Giridih.Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand.Opp. Party

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vijay Kr. Roy, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Anuradha Sahay, Addl. P.P.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

Order No:- 02, Dated:- 16th June, 2026

Heard the parties.

This is the second journey of the petitioner for grant of regular bail.

Earlier, the prayer of the petitioner for grant of regular bail was rejected on merit.

The petitioner has moved before this Court for grant of bail in connection with Giridih (T) P.S. Case No. 420 of 2013, registered for the offences punishable under sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the prayer of the petitioner for grant of regular bail of the petitioner was rejected on merit vide order dated 17.04.2026 and the only fresh ground is that the co-accused person has been granted bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the allegation against the co-accused person who has been granted bail, stands on different footing. It is next submitted that in view of the direct allegation of serious nature against the petitioner and as the prayer of the petitioner for regular bail has already been rejected on merit, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the

evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, as well as the fact that the prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit, this Court is of the considered view that the mere fact is that the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time, and the co-accused the allegation against whom stands on different footing was granted bail, is not a sufficient ground to review the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner which has earlier been rejected on merit, therefore, this Court is not inclined to admit the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is *rejected* for the same reasons as mentioned in the order dated **17.04.2026** passed in **B.A. No. 2858 of 2026**.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated – 16.06.2026
Aditi