

(2025) 07 JH CK 1175
In the Jharkhand High Court
Case No : B. A. No. 4063 Of 2025

Manish Kumar @ Manish Gope @ Chhotu Yadav, S/o
Harendra Yadav @ Late Harndra Yadav

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Jharkhand

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 04-07-2025

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120B, 307, 342
Arms Act, 1959 — Section 27

Citation : (2025) 07 JH CK 1175

Hon'ble Judges : Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : P.P.N. Roy, Pragati Prasad, Fahad Allam

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner named above has been made accused in connection with Bankmore P.S. Case No. 273 of 2022(S.T. No. 392 of 2023, G.R. No. 956 of 2023) for the offence registered under Sections 342, 307, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of Arms Act, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-XVI, Dhanbad.

Earlier the prayer for bail of this petitioner was rejected twice by this Court on merit. Prayer for bail of the petitioner is being renewed on the ground that out of sixteen charge-sheeted witnesses, eight have been examined and the trial is not likely to conclude within reasonable time. The petitioner is languishing the jail custody for two and half years.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that in view of commencement of trial, there is a change of circumstance for pressing the bail. Reliance is placed on (2012) 1 SCC 40 (Sanjay Chandra Vs. Central Bureau of

Investigation). In view of the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court, the petitioner deserves to be enlarged on bail.

Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail. Considering the stage of trial and the nature of offence, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to the privilege of bail.

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

The Trial Court is directed to expedite the trial.