

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 8521 of 2026

Akshay Kumar aged about 32 years, son of Suryanarayan Singh,
Resident of Simanpur, P.O. and P.S. Amour, District Godda

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Jasvindar Mazumdar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Rakesh Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

05/16.09.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Belbadda P.S. Case No. 39 of 2026, for the offences registered under Sections 331(2), 332(b), 333, 115(2), 118(2), 303(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S. 2023, pending in the court of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Godda.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the incident had happened on 30.05.2026 and the FIR has been lodged on 08.06.2026 by the husband of the victim alleging that the petitioner along with two other persons who happened to be his neighbours had entered into his house and assaulted her with iron rod and also bricks due to which she suffered grievous injuries. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and no material which is alleged to have been stolen has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The learned counsel has submitted that charge has already been framed and so far as the allegation is concerned, there is general and omnibus allegation against all the named accused persons and therefore the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.
4. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner of causing grievous injury on the vital part of the body and all the three persons have been named by the victim as neighbours who assaulted her, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation against the petitioner of causing grievous injury at the vital part of the body by the persons living in the neighbourhood, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after a period of six months from today.

7. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 16.09.2026

Uploaded on 17.09.2026

Binit/