

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**I.A. No. 2114 of 2024**

**In**

**Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 229 of 2024**

Rajkeshwar Yadav @ Vinod Yadav ..... Appellant  
Versus  
The State of Jharkhand .....Respondent

-----

**CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rongon Mukhopadhyay**  
**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Deepak Roshan**

-----

For the Appellant : Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Adv.  
For the Respondents : Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Spl.PP

**4/30.04.2024** Heard Mr. Ramesh Kumar, learned counsel  
for the appellant and Mrs. Priya Shrestha, learned Spl.P.P  
appearing for the State.

**2.** This interlocutory application has been preferred  
by the appellant for condoning a delay of 14 days in filing  
the appeal.

**3.** Having been satisfied with the reasons assigned in  
the instant application, the same is allowed and the delay  
of 14 days in filing the appeal is hereby condoned.

**4.** I.A. No.2114 of 2024 stands disposed of.

**Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 229 of 2024.**

**5.** This appeal is directed against the order dated  
05.01.2024 passed in B.P. No. 844 of 2023, by the  
learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Palamau at  
Daltonganj, arising out of Chhattarpur, P.S. Case No. 166  
of 2023; whereby and whereunder the prayer for bail of  
the appellant has been rejected.

**6.** It has been alleged that the appellant and another  
accused person were apprehended by the police and from  
their possession two mobiles were recovered and from the  
*dickey* of the motorcycle Rs. 5,00,000/- was recovered. It  
has further been alleged that the amount which was  
recovered was on account of levy collected which was to

be handed over to the Zonal Commander of an extremists group.

**7.** Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant is in custody since 3.09.2023. It has further been submitted that the embargo under section 43 (D) (V) of the UPA Act will not be attracted on the ground that the allegations levelled against the appellant come under chapter III of the UAP Act.

**8.** Learned Spl. P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

**9.** Regard being had to the period of custody of the appellant we while setting aside the order dated 05.01.2024 passed in B.P. No. 844 of 2023, by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Palamau at Daltonganj, arising out of Chhattarpur, P.S. Case No. 166 of 2023, direct that the appellant be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Palamau at Daltonganj, arising out of Chhattarpur, P.S. Case No. 166 of 2023

**10.** Accordingly, this appeal is allowed.

***(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)***

***(Deepak Roshan, J.)***

Amardeep/