IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 7645 of 2026

Vishnu Hansda 29 years, son of Bhola Hansda, resident of Banjhi Bazar, P.O. Banjhi, P.S. Borio, District – Sahibganj, Jharkhand.

… … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sabyasanchi, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Manoj Kr. Mishra, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Raja Ravi Shekhar Singh, Advocate

07/**02.09.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. The counter affidavit is taken on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Borio P.S. Case No.22/2026, registered under Sections 103 (1), 3 (5) of BNS, 2023, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Sahibganj.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and the informant is not the eyewitness of the case. He has further submitted that charge sheet has been submitted but charge has not been framed so far.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the incident took place on 11.03.2026 and that the natural witnesses, who were not eyewitnesses, arrived at the place of occurrence only after the incident had occurred. He has further submitted that there are two eyewitnesses in the case diary in paragraphs 76 and 77, but their statement has been recorded on 16.04.2026 and the delay is unexplained.

6. The learned counsel then submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. With respect to the criminal antecedents, he submits that the petitioner has already been enlarged on bail in both previous cases by the learned trial court itself.

7. The learned counsel for the State and the Informant have

opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that in the re-statement, the informant has given complete description of the incident and he also appears to be eyewitness of the entire occurrence, and apart from that there are two independent eyewitnesses at paragraphs 76 and 77 of the case diary. They submit that this is a case of brutal murder of the deceased and that the previous cases were also in connection with the deceased only.

8. The learned counsel for the informant submits that there are three cases against the petitioner, two are police cases and one is complaint case filed by the deceased, which is pending. It has come in paragraph 80 of the case diary.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct and specific allegation against the petitioner, which is supported by the eyewitnesses to the occurrence, and this case being a case of brutal murder, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The prayer for bail is, accordingly, rejected.

10. At the request of the learned counsel for the petitioner and in order to expedite the trial, the State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the court. If any FSL report is awaited, the same shall also be forwarded to the court concerned at the earliest.

11. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of police of the concerned district for compliance.

12. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:02.09.2026
Saurav
Date of Uploading:03.09.2026