[2026:JHHC:13435]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.3855 of 2026

Arbind Kumar Saw @ Laddu Saw @ Arvind Kumar Saw, aged about 19 years, S/o Amar Saw, R/o Golden Pahari, Surunga, P.O.- Surunga, P.S.- Tisra, District- Dhanbad, State- Jharkhand.

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Raj Nandan Chatterjee, Advocate
Ms. Juhi Kumari, Advocate
Ms. Priya Saw, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Ajay Kr. Pathak, Addl.P.P

Order No.03 Dated-06-05-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Tisra P.S. Case No.51 of 2025 corresponding to S.T. Case No.702 of 2025 registered under Section 317 (4), 317 (5), 112, 3 (5) of the B.N.S, 2023.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail as earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was rejected by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 10.02.2026 passed in B.A. No.10706 of 2025.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that five stolen motorcycles were recovered, two from the football ground and three from the forest area at the instance of the petitioner and the co-accused persons and the petitioner was apprehended from the football ground. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that the fresh ground is that the petitioner has remained in custody from some more time and save and except the confessional statement, there is no other material in the record. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that the matter involves an organized crime by gang of motorcycle lifters and on the basis of disclosure statement of the petitioner and others, the stolen motorcycles were recovered and the petitioner is also having criminal antecedent, hence, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence if released on bail. It is, therefore, submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail at this stage.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner, his criminal antecedent as well as his chance of absconding and tampering with the evidence as also the prayer for bail of the petitioner has already been rejected on merit and the only fresh ground is that the petitioner has been in custody for some more time, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be released on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected for the same reasons as mentioned in the detailed order dated 10.02.2026 passed in B.A. No.10706 of 2025.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated-06.05.2026-Animesh/