2026:JHHC:13513

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3144 of 2026

Manoj Jha @ Manoj Kumar Jha, son of Ganesh Jha **… …** **Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. B. M. Tripathi, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Naveen Kumar Jaiswal, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Tiwari, Advocate

03/6th May 2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Tandwa P.S. Case No. 273 of 2025 for the offence registered under Sections 316(2), 318(2), 319(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of BNS and Sections 66(C), 66(D) of IT Act, now said to have been pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chatra.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected by this Court in B.A. No. 1686/2026 vide order dated 12.03.2026. He submits that on that date, after some argument, when this Court was not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, the petitioner sought permission for withdrawal of the bail application. The learned senior counsel submits that though the petitioner has as many as 15 criminal antecedents, but in some of the cases, he has been acquitted and in some of the cases, he has been granted bail. He has further submitted that this is the only case, in which the petitioner is in custody. He submits that charge has already been framed.

3. Learned counsel for the opposite party has opposed the prayer and has submitted that it is a case of cyber-crime, wherein through mobile communication, a sum of Rs. 33,00,000/- has been defrauded.

4. To this, the learned senior counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is ready to deposit Rs. 33,00,000/- by way of demand draft subject to the result of the case and as a condition of bail and undertakes to co-operate with the trial.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that earlier when this Court was not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail, the bail application of the petitioner was withdrawn. The petitioner has numerous criminal cases and there is direct allegation against the petitioner of committing cyber fraud.

6. So far as the submission of learned senior counsel for the petitioner to deposit Rs. 33,00,000/- as a condition for bail is concerned, this Court is of the view that such deposit would not serve any purpose, as in the event of conviction also , the said amount cannot be adjusted or given to the victim.

7. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is rejected.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through ‘e-mail/FAX’.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 06.05.2026
Uploaded On: 09.05.2026
Mukul/-