IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3558 of 2026

Yusuf Ansari, aged about 29 years, Son of Lukman Mian
… … Petitioner

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shivam Utkarsh Sahay, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Someshwar Roy, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Ayub Ansari, Advocate

05/**28.04.2026**

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

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that this bail application has been filed in connection with Taratand P.S. Case No. 16 of 2025 (POCSO Case No. 77 of 2025), for the alleged offence registered under Sections 137(2)/96 of B.N.S, 2023 and Section 4 of the POCSO Act and Charge has been framed against the petitioner under Section 137(2), 96, 64(2)(m), 127(3) of BNS and under Section 4, 6 of POCSO Act pending in the court of learned Special Judge POCSO Act, Giridih.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge has been framed on 23.09.2025 and only one witness has been examined since then i.e. on 17.12.2025. However, the victim has not been examined. **The next date in the trial court is 12.05.2026**. He has also submitted that the earlier bail application of the petitioner was rejected on 08.10.2025 in B.A. No.9181 of 2025 and the learned trial court was to expedite the trial. He has also submitted that in the First Information Report, no allegation regarding POCSO has been made. However, the charge has been framed under POCSO Act also on the basis of the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the State shall promptly produce the witnesses. The next date of the case before the learned trial court is 12.05.2026 has already been taken note by the learned counsel for the State.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner and the bail application was earlier rejected on merits, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

6. The impugned order reveals that inspite of repeated letters issued to the concerned authority, witnesses were not being produced before the concerned court.

7. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witnesses before the court , the next date is 12.05.2026.

8. 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.

9. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

28.04.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-29.04.2026