

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.10237 of 2025

Padmalochan Singh, aged about 23 years, son of Guru Charan Singh,
Resident of Village- Purnapani, Post- Nimdih, Police Station- Nimdih,
District- Seraikella Kharsawan. ... Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand. ... Opposite Party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vikash Kumar, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, A.P.P.

Order No.03/Dated- 27th November, 2025

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Gamharia P.S. Case No. 12 of 2022 corresponding to S.T. Case No. 98 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 364, 302, 201/34 of the I.P.C., which is pending in the Court of Learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Seraikella.
3. Earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected by this Court vide order dated 02.08.2024 in B.A. No.5203 of 2024.
4. As per F.I.R. the son of the informant was working in Tata Steel Gamharia Plant and he was living in a rented premises near Madhusudan Maidan. The present petitioner has taken Rs.9,20,000/- in the month of September, 2021 from the son of the informant to secure him a job and there was demand to return the same by the informant's son. Further, there was a conversation on mobile between the son of the informant's son and the petitioner after which the phone of the informant's son was going switched off.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. and for no reason he is languishing in jail since 01.02.2022. Petitioner undertakes to co-operate in the trial of the case by remaining physically present as and when required and shall not indulge in any manner in tampering with the prosecution evidences or influencing

the witnesses of prosecution or similar criminal activities, hence, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned Addl. P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. There is no fresh ground adduced by the learned counsel for the petitioner and it is clear from the status report that out of 12 witnesses, 11 witnesses have been examined and the trial is likely to be concluded soon. Hence, petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail at present, which stands rejected.

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

27.11.2025

Amar/-

Uploaded.