

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B. A. No. 10691 of 2019

Manoj Sahu, Son of Rajendra Sahu Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand. Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

Through Video Conferencing

For the Petitioner : Mr. Avishek Prasad, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sudhir Kumar Mahto, Advocate

08/26.06.2020:

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.11.2018 in connection with Kisko P.S. Case No. 41 of 2018 (S.T. No. 14/2019) for alleged offence registered under Sections 10 and 13 of the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act and Section 17 of Criminal Law Amendment Act (Charge has been framed under Section 3/4 of the Explosive Substance Act and Section 17 of Criminal Law Amendment Act), now said to be pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV, Lohardaga.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 06.08.2019 in B.A. No. 5176/2019 and therefore he has renewed his prayer for bail considering the period of custody. The learned counsel has referred to the supplementary-affidavit and submits that three co-accused, namely, Banesh Nagesiya, Niraj Munda and Ramdeo Ganjhu have been enlarged on bail by Co-ordinate Benches of this Court in B.A. No. 4721/2019 and B.A. No. 7297/2019 respectively. The learned counsel further submits that there was a direction to expedite the trial of the petitioner, but the trial has not yet concluded.

4. The learned counsel for the opposite party-State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 06.08.2019 on merits of the case. He submits that the trial is in progress and a number of witnesses have been examined.
5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that earlier the bail application of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 06.08.2019 on merits considering the allegations made against the petitioner and there is much progress in the trial, in as much as, out of eight charge-sheeted witnesses five have already been examined as per the report received from the learned court below including the informant and the investigating officer of the case. This Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and accordingly, the present bail application is hereby rejected.
6. Let a copy of this order be immediately communicated to the learned court below through 'e-mail/FAX'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Mukul/-