IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3840 of 2026

Jamir Ray @ Alfaj son of Nayum Ray … … **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Victim (Name, address and details of the victim has been given in sealed envelope) … … **Opp. Parties**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Ajay Kumar Pathak, APP

04/**07.05.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 16.04.2025 in connection with Chandwa P.S. Case No. 76 of 2025, corresponding to S.T. No. 199 of 2025, for the offences registered under Sections 96 of the B.N.S. 2023 and section 69 of the BNS, 2023 pending in the court of learned Sessions Judge, Latehar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier rejected on 20.11.2025 in B.A. No. 8196 of 2025. He submits that though there is direct allegation against the petitioner but the victim had not fully supported the case in her statement under Section 183 of the BNSS. However, she had been examined before the court and has given a different statement. He submits that apparently the victim has given evidence before the court under pressure of her family members. He has submitted that 2 out of 7 witnesses has been examined so far.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the victim has supported the allegation during her examination before the court and other witness has also supported the prosecution case. There is direct allegation made against the petitioner.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation against the petitioner and the fact that bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier and also the fact

that the trial is going on, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

7. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned District and to the Director, Prosecution.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 07.05.2026

Uploaded on 09.05.2026

Binit/