

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

**B.A. No. 9398 of 2021**

---

Alok Yadav @ Amresh Yadav @ Amaresh Yadav aged about 36 years,  
son of Kamleshwar Prasad Yadav, resident of village Kashinagar,  
Redma, P.O. Chiyanki, P.S. Medninagar, District Palamau

.... .. **Petitioner**

*Versus*

The State of Jharkhand

... .. **Opposite Party**

---

**CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Dilip Kr. Chakraverty, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Naveen Kr. Gaunjhu, A.P.P.

---

**Through Video Conferencing**

---

03/10.09.2021 Heard Mr. Dilip Kr. Chakraverty, learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. Heard Mr. Naveen Kr. Gaunjhu, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party- State of Jharkhand.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Gurdari P.S. Case No. 03 of 2017 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 158 of 2017, registered under Sections 147/148/149/353/385/379/387/435/427/34 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 27 of the Arms Act and Section 17 of C.L.A. Act, now pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1<sup>st</sup> Class at Gumla.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier vide order dated 06.07.2019 in B.A. No. 1242 of 2019, thereafter, vide order dated 29.05.2020 in B.A. No. 910 of 2020 and again, vide order dated 22.01.2021 in B.A. No. 9033 of 2020. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail on account of his custody since 15.09.2018. He submits that out of 13 witnesses, only 09 witnesses have been examined so far by the prosecution.

5. Learned counsel for the State, on the other hand, while

opposing the prayer for bail has submitted that the trial is at advanced stage and he also assures this Court that the prosecution will ensure production of the witnesses as and when the date is fixed by the learned court below for the purpose of their examination. However, he submits that there are criminal antecedents against the petitioner and accordingly, considering the seriousness of offence, he may not be enlarged on bail.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of this case and also the fact that the bail application of the petitioner has been rejected thrice earlier, and considering the seriousness of allegation coupled with the fact that the trial is at advanced stage, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court below through "FAX/email".

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

*Pankaj/-*