IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 6658 of 2026

XXX … … **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand … … **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashish Kumar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Gautam Rakesh, A.P.P.

05/**18.08.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Counter affidavit filed during the court proceeding is taken on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with S.T. Case No. 80 of 2026, arising out of Rajnagar P.S. Case No. 12 of 2026, for the offences registered under Sections 64 of the B.N.S. 2023 and grievance has been taken under section 64(1) of the B.N.S. pending in the court of learned District and Additional Sessions Judge-II-, at Seraikella.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.03.2026 and charge has been framed 30.07.2026. The petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and there is delay of 04 days in lodging the FIR. The learned counsel has also submitted that the victim is alleged to have been taken to another place where the rape was committed but there is no recovery and no sign of any pooja ceremony has been found. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no injury or sign of rape has been found during medical examination.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioner.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties this court finds that there is specific allegation against the petitioner and the victim has also supported the allegation in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS. The allegation against the petitioner is that the victim went to the house of petitioner along with another person for

the purposes of performing rituals. After conducting the puja ceremony, the petitioner told the victim that some additional rituals is required to be performed outside the house and on that pretext, he took the victim outside the house and taking advantage of the trust of the victim, committed rape upon her. In view of the specific allegation against the petitioner, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

7. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 18.08.2026

Uploaded on: 20.08.2026

Binit/