

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 9835 of 2025

Sudeep Bhakat, aged about 30 years, son of Samir Bhagat, resident of Bara Gamharia, Nemo Para, Post- Gamharia, Police Station Gamharia, District- Seraikella- Kharsawan **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vikash Kumar, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : None

04/19.02.2026 Heard Mr. Vikash Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Learned A.P.P. is not present.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.03.2025 in connection with S.T. Case No.117 of 2025 arising out of Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 65 of 2024, registered under Sections 309(4) of the B.N.S., subsequently chargesheet has been submitted under Section 310 (2) of the B.N.S., now pending in the court of Additional Sessions Judge-II, Seraikella.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that apart from confessional statement, there is no other material against the petitioner. He further submits that similarly situated co-accused persons namely Basudeo Mahato @ Basudev Mahato and two other co-accused namely Bibekanand Patar @ Vivek and Nibaran Pradhan have been enlarged on bail in B.A. No.9008 of 2025 and B.A. No.8473 of 2025 respectively. He further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.03.2025. He submits that charge has been framed on 17.07.2025 and no witness has been examined.

5. However, during course of hearing and upon the query of this court, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has two criminal antecedents. He has also submitted that the looted material, which is alleged to have recovered from the petitioner is the Tab of Samsung company but tried to explain by submitting that the petitioner was an employee of the company and therefore, he was in possession of Tab.

6. Considering the aforesaid arguments, this court finds in the F.I.R. itself, amongst the stolen articles, the stolen Tab has mentioned which has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and further, the petitioner has two other criminal antecedents.
7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.
8. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witness before the court.
9. The learned counsel of the State is directed to forward a copy of this order to the concerned authority for compliance.
10. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: 19.02.2026

Jay/-

Date of Uploading: 19.02.2026