

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 11940 of 2020

Suman Kumar Das Petitioner
 Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. A.K. Chaturvedi, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, Advocate

Through Video Conferencing

8/10.09.2021

1. Heard Mr. A.K. Chaturvedi, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner.
2. Heard Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Tandwa P.S. Case No. 11 of 2019, G.R. No. 744 of 2019 for the offence alleged under Sections 385,387 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 17 (i) (ii) of the C.L.A. Act, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chatra.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier by this court vide order dated 06.09.2019 in B.A. No. 6790 of 2019 and thereafter on 18.09.2020 in B.A. No. 1044 of 2020. He further submits that the only allegation against the petitioner is his involvement in the extremist activities and there is no material evidence against the petitioner.
5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the petitioner has a number of criminal antecedents and he has also been remanded in other cases. Learned counsel has also submitted that he will ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the learned court

below as when the date is fixed for production of witnesses so that the trial of the petitioner may be expedited.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the facts and circumstances of this case and also the fact that bail application of the petitioner was rejected twice earlier and it has come on record that he has a number of criminal antecedents and it has also been mentioned in para 132 of the case diary that because of his activities, the people of the locality were in state of fear, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. A report has also been received from the learned court below that altogether 4 prosecution witnesses have already been examined. Considering the totality of the facts and circumstances of the case, prayer for bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.
7. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Binit/