IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.3293 of 2026

Hans Pal Munda @ Hans Pal, Age- 33 Years, S/o- Kandan Munda, R/o- Vill- Huwanghatu, P.O.- Taimara, P.S.- Namkum, Dist- Ranchi, Jharkhand.

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rahul Pandey, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, Spl.P.P

Order No.02 Dated-01-05-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with N.D.P.S. Case No. 15 of 2025 arising out of Ormanjhi P.S. Case No. 179 of 2024 (N) registered for the offence punishable under Sections 17(c), 25, 29 of the N.D.P.S. Act.

This is the third journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was rejected by this Court vide order dated 09.06.2025 passed in B.A. No. 3859 of 2025 and subsequently, the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn by this Court vide order dated 30.01.2026 passed in B.A. No. 368 of 2026.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the fresh ground is that the petitioner has been in custody for some more time. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 17.12.2024 as mentioned in para-1 of the instant bail application. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to co-operate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State on the other hand

opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the mere fact that the petitioner has been in custody for some more time is not a ground to reconsider the prayer for bail of the petitioner. It is next submitted that there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be released on bail.

Considering that the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner has earlier been rejected on merits, hence, this Court is of the considered view that the mere fact that the petitioner has remained in custody for some more time is not a ground to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above named petitioner is rejected for the same reasons as mentioned in the order dated 09.06.2025 passed in B.A. No. 3859 of 2025.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated:- 01.05.2026
Saroj/