IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 7810 of 2026

Hasbul Ansari @ Hasibul Ansari, aged about 26 years, S/o Hanif Ansari, R/o Khunti Tola, P.O.- Sons, P.S.- Chanho, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

03/**20.08.2026**

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner is present.

2. Learned counsel for the State Ms. Sushma Aind, Advocate is present.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 21.08.2023 in connection with Chanho P.S. Case No. 170 of 2021, for the alleged offence registered under Section 304B/34 of IPC pending in the court of Learned Additional Judicial Commissioner -XV, Ranchi.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 21.08.2023, but trial has not concluded. He has submitted that the 1st witness was examined only on 21.05.2026 and thereafter, 3 witnesses have been examined till 13.08.2026 while the remaining 3 witnesses are yet to be examined. The next date is on 03.09.2026.

5. Learned counsel has further submitted that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected twice earlier, once in B.A. No. 8862 of 2024 vide order dated 21.01.2025 and thereafter in B.A. No. 9716 of 2025 vide order dated 14.11.2025. He has also submitted that there is no eye witness so far amongst the witnesses who have been examined.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail. She has submitted that there is an allegation against the petitioner, who is the *Bhaisur* of the deceased

died due to burn injuries within 7 months of her marriage in her matrimonial home, that it was the petitioner who immolated the deceased.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that bail application of the petitioner was rejected twice earlier on merits and there is serious allegation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

8. The instant bail application is hereby ***rejected.***

9. However, there can be no reason on the part of the prosecution for not producing the witnesses promptly before the court. It is surprising that the first witness was examined only on 21.05.2026. However, only 3 witnesses remain to be examined. The next date is 03.09.2026.

10. The learned counsel for the State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are produced promptly before the court.

11. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution as well as Superintendent of Police of the concerned district. The concerned Superintendent of Police shall take special care to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the court. The next date, as indicated by the learned counsel for the petitioner, is 03.09.2026.

12. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

20.08.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-24.08.2026