

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.51 of 2026

Siddharth Jeph @ Siddharth Jeph @ Siddharth, aged about 30 years,
S/o Rohit Ashwa Meena, R/o-299, Vivek Vihar, near Rawat School,
near Sanganer Road, Sodala, P.O. & P.S.-Jaipur, District-Jaipur,
Rajasthan.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ankit Apurva, Advocate
: Mr. Vivek Singh, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Shweta Singh, Addl.P.P

Order No.04 Dated- 23-04-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Airport P.S. Case No.40 of 2024 corresponding to S.T. Case No.783 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 140(2), 140(3), 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 and Section 25(1-B) (a), 26, 35 of Arms Act.

This is the third journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail, earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 31.01.2025 in B.A. No.10720 of 2024 and subsequently, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed for non-prosecution vide order dated 08.10.2025 in B.A. No.6399 of 2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is that in the meanwhile, one witness has been examined so far and he has identified the petitioner and has supported the case of the prosecution. It is next submitted that the petitioner undertakes that he will co-operate with the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has been in custody for a considerable period of time. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the examination of PW-1 is an

aggravating factor and is not a mitigating factor for the purpose of bail, when the PW-1 has supported the case of the prosecution in entirety and even identified the petitioner. It is further submitted that there is every chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail. It is therefore submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail.

Considering the fact that the prayer for bail of the petitioner was earlier rejected and in view of serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of abducting the victim for ransom and the sole witness so far claimed to have been examined by the prosecution has supported the case of the prosecution and identified the petitioner in Court as also the chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

23/04/2026

Abhiraj/