(2026:JHHC:13401)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3801 of 2026

Md. Mumtaj @ Md. Mumtaz, aged about 37 years, son of Md. Murtuja @ Murtuza, resident of Village –Gudri Bazar, P.O. – Chatra, P.S. –Sadar, District –Chatra.

… Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand … Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Santosh Kr. Soni, Advocate

: Mr. Sushant Kr. Sinha, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kr. Mishra, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 06.05.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Chatra Sadar P.S. Case No.33 of 2020 corresponding to S.T. No. 97 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 342, 353, 332, 333, 307 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 3 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail and earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 17.02.2026 in B.A. No. 10643 of 2025. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is that, on 10.02.2020 when the informant along with armed forces were deputed on law and order duty, only because three boys riding a motorcycle raised slogans, the petitioner along with the co-accused persons being member of an unlawful assembly armed with deadly weapons gathered in 100-150 in numbers and attempted to murder the police personnel deputed at the spot causing severe injury on the head of a constable and when the SDPO and his driver were trying to save the injured constable, the petitioner along with the co-accused persons being the members of an unlawful assembly being armed with deadly

weapons attacked the S.D.P.O. with iron rod causing injury to him besides causing damage to the wireless set of the police. It is then submitted that the petitioner was absconding for over five years and he has been in custody since 20.08.2025 only; as has been mentioned in para -1 of the bail application. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is next submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the co-accused person has already been admitted to bail by a coordinate bench of this Court vide order dated 17.12.2021 in B.A. No. 13929 of 2021. 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 and submits that keeping in view he is fact that the petitioner was absconding for more than five years, there is every chance of the petitioner again absconding if released on bail and he is a threat to the law and order situation in the locality. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the chance of his absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail, this Court is not inclined to admit the petitioner on bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for regular bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

06.05.2026
Sonu/