IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 7719 of 2024

Rajendar Kumar Das @ Rajendar Das, aged about 21 years, S/o. Angrej Das, Vill.- Kesargarha, P.O.- Pathrol, P.S.- Madhupur, Dist.- Deoghar, Jharkhand. … … Petitioner

-Versus -

The State of Jharkhand ... … Opposite Party

With

B.A. No. 7820 of 2024

Pappu Kumar Yadav @ Pappu Kumar, aged about 25 years, S/o. Kanchan Yadav @ Kamchan Mahto, R/o. Vill.- Jalhara, P.O.- Magdiha, P.S.- Sarwan, Dist.- Deoghar.

… … Petitioner

-Versus -

The State of Jharkhand ... … Opposite Party

With

B.A. No. 7717 of 2024

Niranjan Das, aged about 37 years, S/o. Late Gareeb Das, Vill.- Kesargarha, P.O.- Pathrol, P.S.- Madhupur, Dist.- Deoghar, Jharkhand.

… … Petitioner

-Versus -

The State of Jharkhand ... … Opposite Party

With

B.A. No. 7721 of 2024

Surendra Kumar Ray @ Surendra Kumar, aged about 20 years, S/o. Late Tarni Ray, R/o. Vill.- Jalhara, P.O.- Magdiha, P.S.- Sarwan, Dist.- Deoghar. … … Petitioner

-Versus -

The State of Jharkhand ... … Opposite Party

CORAM: - HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMBUJ NATH

For the Petitioners : Mr. A. K. Kashyap, Sr. Advocate
: Mr. Shahid Yunus, Advocate
: Mr. Niranjan Kumar, Advocate
: Mr. Rahul Ranjan, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, A.P.P.
: Mr. S.K. Tiwari, Spl. P.P.
: Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Spl. P.P.
: Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, A.P.P.

04/16.12.2024

Heard the parties.

2. All these bail applications arise out of the same police case. Accordingly, all these bail applications are being disposed of by a common order.

3. The petitioners have been made accused in connection with Deoghar Cyber P.S. Case No. 69/2024, for the offences registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 & 120(B) of the I.P.C. and Sections 66(B), 66(C), 66(D) and 84(C) of the I.T. Act, pending in the Court of learned A.S.J.-II, Deoghar.

4. The petitioners are alleged to be involved in cyber offence. On 27.06.2024, Cyber police Deoghar apprehended these petitioners alongwith co-accused persons near the village Jalhara. On search, mobile phones, e-gadgets and other articles were recovered from their possession.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of these petitioners and submitted that during the course of investigation, victims have come forward to state that the mobile phones, recovered from these petitioners, were used for cheating them.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of these petitioners submitted that one of the co-accused persons namely Rahul Das @ Rahul Kumar Das against whom one of the victims has appeared and stated that he has been cheated, has been granted bail by this Court in B.A. No. 7618/2024.

7. When co-accused Rahul Das @ Rahul Kumar Das was granted bail by this Court, Case Diary was called for from the Court concerned. The Case Diary was received up to the particular date and in that Case Diary, no victim was traced out who was cheated by Co-accused Rahul Das @ Rahul Kumar Das. However, when the investigation got completed, statement of one of the victim was recorded that he was cheated by Rahul Das @ Rahul Kumar Das.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts, I am not inclined to release the petitioners, on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioners stands rejected.

9. The petitioners, is so advised, may renew their prayer for bail after three months.

(Ambuj Nath, J.)

Rahul/-