IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 6010 of 2026

Robart Munda son of Late Chamra Munda … … **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand … … **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sunil Kumar Ganjhu, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Mishra, APP

02/**01.07.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Arki P.S. Case No. 14 of 2011, corresponding to Sessions Trial Case No. 215/2014(A) for the offences registered under Sections 302/34 of IPC and Section ¾ of the Prevention of Witch (Daain) Practices Act, pending in the court of learned District and Additional Sessions Judge, 1st Khunti.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 01.03.2026 and in the trial, 06 out of 10 witnesses have been examined and all the 06 witnesses turned hostile including the informant. The petitioner is named in the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the charge sheet was submitted way back in the year 2011 and there is direct allegation against the petitioner for killing the mother of the informant alleging her as Daain. The petitioner remained absconder and permanent warrant of arrest was issued against him. He submits that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is likelihood that he may again abscond. The petitioner was arrested and forwarded to the court on 01.03.2026. The trial has hampered on account of non-cooperation. However, he submits that the remaining witnesses will also be examined.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the petitioner remained absconder and was arrested on the basis of permanent warrant of arrest and the trial is in progress and there is direct allegation against the petitioner , this court

is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

7. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned District and to the Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

8. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 01.07.2026

Uploaded on 02.07.2026

Binit/