

(2026:JHHC:29804)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 9301 of 2026

Laxman Ganjhu @ Motu, aged about 21 years, s/o Dashrath
Ganjhu, r/o Village-Chama, P.O.-Chama, P.S.-Chanho, Dist.-
Ranchi

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Kumari Rashmi, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 06.10.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with S.T. No. 174 of 2025 arising out of Balumath P.S. Case No.15 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 111(4)/111(2) (b)/308(2)/308(3)/308(4)/351(2)/3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

This is the third journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail and earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn as well as was rejected on merit vide orders dated 14.07.2025 in B.A. No. 5820 of 2025 and 14.11.2025 in B.A. No. 9433 of 2025 respectively. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is that in the meanwhile, no witness has been examined and the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is next submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of being an infamous kingpin of an organized gang of extortionist in the name and style of 'Shoshan Mukh Sangathan' is habitually involved in collection of

extortions from various contractors, by terrorizing the employees of different contractors and in view of his criminal antecedent as has been mentioned in paragraph no.20 of the bail application, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail. It is lastly submitted that merely because the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time, the same is not a sufficient ground to admit the petitioner on bail. Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail as well as his criminal antecedents, this Court is of the considered view that the mere fact that the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time is not a sufficient ground to admit the petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the abovenamed petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

06.10.2026
Gunjan-