

( 2026:JHHC:20099 )

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**B.A. No. 6326 of 2026**

-----

Sudeep Sinku @ Sudip Sinku, son of Shankar Sinku, aged about 39 years, resident of House No. 77, Village-Juntugara, Near Water Pump, P.O.-Maluka, P.S.-Jagannathpur, Dist.-West Singhbhum, Jharkhand ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opposite Party

-----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY**

-----

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anurag Kashyap, Advocate

: Mr. Jorong J. Sanga, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Devesh Krishna, SC Mines III

-----

**Order No.02 Dated- 08.07.2026**

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Gua P.S. Case No.43 of 2025 (G.R. No. 99 of 2026) registered for the offences punishable under sections 316(2)/316(5)/318(4)/3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner being the Manager of Bank of India, Gua Branch has embezzled Rs.2,14,81,192.30/- from the account of Steel Authority of India Limited, Gua by transferring the same to the bank account of his near and dear ones. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and though charge sheet has been submitted in this case but no witnesses have been examined as yet. It is next submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as has been mentioned in paragraph no.19 of the bail application. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 19.12.2025, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 18 of the bail application. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

Learned counsel for the State on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view the

serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of embezzling crores of rupees, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

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

**(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**

08.07.2026  
Gunjan-