[2026:JHHC:12989]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. no. 2924 of 2026

Hiralal Yadav, agedabout 40 years, son of Dhatur Mahto, resident of village- Jharlar, P.O. & P.S.- Mohanpur, Dist.- Deoghar … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand … Opp. Party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Manoj Kr. Dubey , Adv.
For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan , Addl. PP

03 / 30.04.2026 Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Mohanpur P. S. case no. 250 of 2023 (S.T. No. 93 of 2024) instituted under Section 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 307, 325, 326 and 120B of IPC.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that this is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail as his earlier bail application was rejected vide order dated 07.05.2024 passed in B.A. No. 832 of 2024. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner committed murder of Shiv Narayan Yadav. It is next submitted that the fresh ground is that in the meanwhile, nine witnesses have been examined during the trial of the case and PW2 who is the brother of the deceased, has categorically stated that in his dying declaration, that the deceased has disclosed that the petitioner along with total eight persons were present, out whom, Dhatur Mahto told that since Shiv Narayan Yadav is to be killed and instructed Baleshwar Mahato to bring *bhujali* (a sharp cutting weapon) and Baleshwar Mahto brought the *bhujali* and Vishnu Yadav cut and severed the left hand of Shiv Narayan Yadav and Shiv Narayan Yadav died while being taking to the hospital. It is next submitted that the specific allegation is against Dhatur Mahto and the only allegation

against the petitioner is that he was also present but there is no overt act attributed to the petitioner. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent, as mentioned in paragraph 16 of the bail application. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been in jail custody since 16.11.2023, as mentioned in para 13 of this bail application. It is next submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case and undertakes not to annoy or disturb the informant or the other witness of the case or their family members in any manner during trial of the case hence, the petitioner may be admitted on bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. opposed the prayer for bail.

Considering submissions of learned counsels and the facts as stated above, I am inclined to release the petitioner on bail. Hence, the court below is directed to release the petitioner on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge, III, cum Special Judge, POCSO, Deoghar in connection with Mohanpur P. S. case no. 250 of 2023 (S.T. No. 93 of 2024) with the condition that the petitioner will not annoy or disturb the informant or the other witness of the case or their family members in any manner during trial of the case and will co-operate with the trial of the case and will furnish mobile phone number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card in the court below with an undertaking that he will not change the mobile phone number during the trial of the case.

(**ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY, J.)**

Dated 30.04.2026
Smita/-