# IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
## B.A. No.5350 of 2026

---

Khemlal Mahto aged about 31 years S/O Dinesh Mahto, R/O Village – Chakarbrai, P.O. – Laxmantunda, P.S. – Nimiaghat, District – Giridih (Jharkhand)

.... .... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... .... .... Opposite Party

---

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY**

---

For the Petitioner : Md. Ayub Ansari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Tarun Kumar, Addl.P.P.

---

**Order No:-02 Dated:-17-06-2026**

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with S.T. Case No. 465 of 2024 arising out of Dumri P.S. Case No.25 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 201 of the Indian Penal Code.

This is the fourth journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was once dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 14.11.2024 passed in B.A. No. 6540 of 2024 and the prayer of regular bail of the petitioner was twice rejected on merit by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide orders dated 19.03.2025 in B.A. No. 2163 of 2025 and 20.03.2026 passed in B.A. No. 9839 of 2026.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is that the trial is not yet been concluded. It is next submitted that 11 witnesses have been examined in this case but all of them have supported the case of the prosecution. It is then submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 26.02.2024 as is evident from para-20 of the instant bail application. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State on the other hand opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that keeping in view the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the overwhelming evidence that has already come on record through the depositions of the witnesses examined during the trial of the case, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as chance of his absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, also as the prayer of the petitioner for regular bail has earlier twice been rejected on merit, this Court is not inclined to admit the above named petitioner to bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

**(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**

Dated:- 17.06.2026
Saroj/