THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.10075 of 2025

Md. Asfaq @ Raju, aged about 33 years, Son of Kamruddin, resident of Pelawal, P.O. Pelawal, P.S. Katkamsandi & District- Hazaribag.

.... …. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashutosh Anand No.2, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, A.P.P

Order No.05 Dated- 09-07-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Ramgarh P.S. Case No. 377 of 2024 along with S.T. Case No. 48 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 140(2), 142, 61(2), 3(5) of the B.N.S, 2023.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail, as the earlier bail application of the petitioner was rejected by this Court vide order dated 21.04.2025 in B.A. No. 3031 of 2025.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the only fresh ground is that P.W.1 has been examined in this case by the prosecution and identified the petitioner in court and has supported the case of the prosecution and the co-accused person Tausif Jawed to whom the P.W.1 did not identify, has been admitted to bail by this Court. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl.P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the evidence which has come on record against the petitioner; stand on different footing than that of co-accused namely Tausif Jawed @ Tousif Javed- who has been admitted to bail in B.A. No.4664 of 2025 vide

order dated 17.06.2025; only because P.W.1 could not identify him in the court, but P.W.1 had identified the petitioner in court and in view of overwhelming evidence, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail. It is therefore, submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and in view of overwhelming evidence that has already come on record including the deposition of P.W.1 and the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is **rejected**.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

09/07/2026
Amar/