[2026:JHHC:12681]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.3566 of 2026

Rabindra Mahanti @ Pintu Mahanti, aged about 67 years, S/o Vishwanath Mahanti, R/o Village- Kasmar, Bankishol, P.O. & P.S.– Dumaria, District- East Singhbhum, Jharkhand.

... . …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Dr. (Mrs.) Vandana Singh, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, A.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 29-04-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Dumaria P.S. Case No. 19 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1) & 3(5) of the B.N.S. 2023.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner in furtherance of common intention with the co-accused persons has committed the murder of Vrindavan Dutt. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is next submitted that the informant of this case is not an eye witness to the occurrence. It is further submitted that the charge-sheet has been submitted, but no witnesses has been examined. It is then submitted that the petitioner has got no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 11 of the instant bail application. It is next submitted that the petitioner undertakes that he will co-operate with the trial of the case and will not annoy or disturb the informant or witnesses of the case. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 14.10.2025 as mentioned in para-10 of the instant bail application. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned Addl.P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of being in furtherance of common

intention with the co-accused has committed murder of the Vrindavan Dutt and there is every chance of the petitioner absconding or 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 direct allegation against the petitioner and the chance of the petitioner absconding or tampering with evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail at this stage. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected at this stage.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

29/04/2026
Amar/