IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. M. P. No. 1621 of 2026
....

Rohit Bharti @ Rohit Kumar Bharti, aged about 28 years, son of Ram Charitra Bharti, resident of Village Kanko, PO and PS- Jainagar, District- Koderma, Jharkhand ...**....Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Santosh Kumar Das son of Sohan Ravidash, resident of Village-Kanko, Ravidash Tola, PO and PS- Jainagar, OP- Telaiya Dam, District- Koderma **..... Opp. Parties**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRASAD

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sahil, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Suraj Deo Munda, A. P. P.

.....

06/19.08.2026 This Cr. M.P. has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 528 of the BNSS, 2023 for extension of time for furnishing the bail bonds in the light of the order dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that after passing the order dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court, the prayer for Anticipatory Bail of the petitioner was allowed by directing him to surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of passing of this order. However, he could not surrender within time. It is submitted that the petitioner is working in a private company at Banglore (Bengaluru), Karnataka and he was not granted leave to appear before the learned Trial Court and as such, he was unable to furnish the bail bonds and hence, further four weeks' time may be allowed to enable him to surrender before the learned Trial Court.

4. Learned counsel for the State raised objection and has submitted that the petitioner has not complied with the order

dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court by which, the prayer for Anticipatory Bail of the petitioner was allowed by directing him to surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of passing of this order. It is submitted that the petitioner has misused the privilege of Anticipatory Bail, which has been granted vide order dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court and hence, there is no merit in this Cr. M. P. and as such, this Cr. M. P. may be dismissed.

5. Heard learned counsels for the parties and from going through the records, it appears that vide order dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court, the prayer for Anticipatory Bail of the petitioner was allowed by directing him to surrender before the learned Trial Court within a period of six (06) weeks from the date of passing of the order. However, the petitioner could not surrender within time.

6. The present Cr. M. P. No. 1621 of 2026 has been filed on 23.04.2026.

7. It appears that the petitioner is working in a private company at Banglore (Bengaluru), Karnataka.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, time for surrendering the petitioner before the learned Court below is further extended for a period of three (03) weeks from today in light of the order dated 09.01.2026 passed in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 625 of 2025 by this Court, subject to payment of cost of Rs. 5,000/- before the learned Member Secretary, JHALSA.

9. Thus, the present Cr. M. P. No. 1621 of 2026 is allowed and stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Prasad, J.)

Dated 19.08.2026
Kamlesh-Shahid/-