IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 2921 of 2026

Arjun Kumar Saw @ Arjun Kumar, aged about 25 years, Son of Sri Khublal Saw … … **Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rohit Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Achinto Sen, Advocate
For the Informant : Mr. Prabhash Ch. Sinha, Advocate

04**/04.05.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 08.02.2026 in connection with Giridih (M) P.S. Case No. 34 of 2026, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2), 118(1), 352, 351(2), 74, 303(2), 125, 109 read with section 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 pending in the court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Giridih.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the first information report (FIR) there is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner and the statement of the victim has not been recorded under section 183 of BNSS which was called for by this Court. Learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Learned counsel has also submitted that two of the co-accused namely Aman Sao and Saro Devi have been enlarged on anticipatory bail by the learned court itself. The FIR reveals that the present petitioner Arjun Kumar Sao is the son of Khublal Sao and Aman Kumar Sao, who has been granted bail, is the brother of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel has also submitted that since similarly situated co-accused have been granted anticipatory bail by the learned court

itself and the charge sheet having also been submitted in the present case, the petitioner may be released on bail.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State and the informant has opposed the prayer.

6. The learned counsel for the informant has stated that injury suffered by the victim is grievous injury as per the medical report and there are multiple injury suffered by the victim.

7. Learned counsel for the State has further submitted that paragraph 9 of the case diary refers to the statement of the eye witness, who has stated that the petitioner had held brick in his hand and made repeated assault on the victim at her head and she suffered grievous head injuries. Learned counsel has submitted that statement of victim has also been recorded in paragraph 67 of the case diary who has made direct allegation of assault against the petitioner and has submitted that the case of the petitioner is not similarly situated as that of the other co-accused who have been enlarged on anticipatory bail.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the victim has suffered grievous injuries and the eye witness as well as the victim have made specific allegation against the petitioner of assault, the case of the petitioner is not similarly situated as that of the other co-accused persons, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

9. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

10. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through ‘FAX/E-mail’.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

04.05.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-04.05.2026