(2026:JHHC:12799)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B. A. No. 2839 of 2026

Md. Guddu @ Guddu Sheikh, s/o Md. Basir, aged about 33 years, r/o village Kasba, PO – Kasba, PS – Mahagama, District – Godda, Jharkhand. **... ... ...Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand. **... ... ...Opp. Party**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arun Kr. Pandey, Advocate
: Ms. Snehlika Bhagat, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sunil Kr. Dubey, Addl. P.P.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

Order No:- 03, Dated:- 30th April, 2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved before this Court for grant of bail in connection with S. T. Case No. 120 of 2024 arising out of Mahagama P.S. Case No. 13 of 2024 registered for the offence punishable under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed the murder of his five-year old son by throttling his neck because the informant-wife of the petitioner dissuaded the petitioner, to sale his land, baecause by selling such land, their son will not be left with any property. It is further submitted that though it has not been specifically mentioned in this bail application but three witnesses have been examined and all of them have supported the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and the petitioner has been in custody since 18.01.2024, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 11 of the bail application. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to cooperate with the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that keeping in view the serious nature of allegation against

the petitioner of committing the murder of his own five-year old son only because his wife dissuaded him to sale their landed property, 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 be admitted to bail.

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

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is ***rejected.***

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Aditi