IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 5834 of 2026

Kuldeep Singh, aged about 20 years, S/o Manoj Singh
… … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Amit Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Fahad Allam, APP

04/**17.07.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 25.02.2026 in connection with Deoghar Cyber P.S. Case No. 30 of 2026 registered under section 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS & Section 66B, 66C, 66D and 84 (C) of I.T. Act pending in the court of learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-II cum Special Judge (Cyber Crime), Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the first information report except that the petitioner was involved in getting the APK file downloaded in the mobile of the victims, there is no further allegation. He has submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has no criminal antecedent and the charge sheet has been submitted on 23.05.2026.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that numerous crime links have been found against the petitioner as has been recorded in paragraph 27 of the case diary, all of them are relating to Maharashtra. Letters have been written to the authorities of the concerned district so that the petitioner can be remanded in those cases. He has also submitted that the victims have also been identified and has referred paragraph 31 of the case diary.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that as per the allegation, the petitioner was involved in cyber offence whereby the petitioner could get control over the mobile of the victim and deal with all the transactions including otp etc. The victims have also been identified who have supported the prosecution case. There are numerous crime links relating to different States for which letter has been sent so that the petitioner can be taken on remand. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. The petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after 8 months.

7. The instant bail application is hereby rejected.

8. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witnesses.

9. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution as well as Superintendent of Police of the concerned district to ensure compliance.

10. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

17.07.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-20.07.2026