

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 9596 of 2025

Satyendra Yadav, aged about 34 years, son of Ramchandra
Yadav, resident of Village Chetma, P.O. & P.S. Mahuadanr, Dist.
Latehar ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. Party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Kumar , Adv.
For the State : Ms. Priya Shreshtha, Spl. PP

05 / 08.06.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Mahuadanr P.S. Case No. 20 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 308 (5), 308(4), 308(7), 3(5) of Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 17 of C.L.A. Act..

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner being the member of a maoist organization, collected extortion amount of Rs. 70,000/- from the information by threatening to kill him unless he gives extortion amount and there is further allegation against the petitioner that part of the extortion amount has been recovered from the co-accused Suraj Nath who was arrested in connection with Mahuadanr P.S. Case No. 18 of 2025. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false and the petitioner is involved in three other cases of extortion but in those cases, he is on bail. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been in jail custody since 16.06.2025 , as mentioned in para 1 of this bail application. 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 bail.

Learned **Spl.** P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view that the petitioner is habitually involved in collection of extortion of terrorist activities of a Maoist organisation and 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 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.)

Dated 08.09.2026
Smita/-