IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3859 of 2026

Meghnath Ghosh, aged about 19 years, S/o Pradeep Ghosh @ Pradip Ghosh … … **Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Swami Nath Prasad Rai, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Bishambhar Shastri, Advocate

02**/07.05.2026**

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

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 11.01.2025 in connection with Radhanagar P.S. Case No. 248 of 2024 corresponding to POCSO Case No. 26 of 2025, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 96 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and charge has been framed under Section 87, 65(1) of the B.N.S and Section 4(2) of the POCSO Act pending in the court of learned Special Judge (POCSO Act), Sahebganj.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier in B.A. No. 8121 of 2025 vide order dated 22.09.2025. The charge has already been framed on 22.04.2025 and no witness has been examined so far and therefore, on the point of custody since 11.01.2025, the petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner and the victim was recovered from the house of the petitioner.

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

6. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

7. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witnesses.

8. There is no forthcoming explanation from the side of the State as to why the witnesses have not been produced so far.

9. 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.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

07.05.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-08.05.2026