IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 7589 of 2026

Amrit Yadav @ Amit Kumar Yadav @ Amrit Kumar, aged about 26 years, son of Madan Yadav @ Madan Prasad Yadav, resident of Village Fursatari, P.O. Baijukura, P.S. Sarawan, District Deoghar, Jharkhand. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arvind Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sardhu Mahto, APP

06/**01.09.2026** Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Sarawan P.S. Case No. 52 of 2026, registered for the offence under Sections 87 and 137(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.05.2026 and the matter is pending for charge. He submits that charge sheet has been submitted under Sections 8 and 12 of POCSO Act and Sections 87 and 137 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the petitioner is a married person living in the neighbourhood and he had seduced the minor girl to go with him to Bengaluru. The victim was taken to Bengaluru and after institution of the case, she came back with the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail at this stage as the victim is yet to be examined before the learned court.

5. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and upon going through the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, it appears that the victim has supported the allegation that the petitioner had taken her to Bengaluru and ultimately, she came back. Since the victim is yet to be

examined and the petitioner happens to be the neighbour of the victim, there is a likelihood that the petitioner may influence the victim. Accordingly, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and hence, this bail application is rejected.

6. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:01.09.2026
Pankaj
Date of Uploading:01.09.2026