IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1013 of 2026

Pinki Kumari @ Rinku Kumari @ Pinki Jagdish Hansda, aged about 28 years, Bhavsingh Manjhi, wife of Jagdish Hansda resident of village- Gayachhanda, Tola Jhamatand, P.O.- Gangjori, P.S.- Jaridih, District- Bokaro

... ... **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... ... **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR RAI

For the Appellant :Mr. Nawal Kishor Pandey, Advocate
For the Res.-State :Ms. Kumari Rashmi, A.P.P.

05/08.09.2026 Heard Mr. Nawal Kishor Pandey, learned counsel for the appellant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

This appeal is directed against the order dated 29.06.2026 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge-II, F..T.C., Bermo at Tenughat in Bail Petition No. 131/2026 in connection with Jaridih P.S. Case No. 51 of 2019, whereby and whereunder, the prayer for regular bail of the appellanthas been rejected.

It has been alleged that the cousin sister of the informant was allured by the appellant and taken to Gujarat, whereafter she became traceless.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the appellant has been falsely implicated in the present case. It has been submitted that, from a perusal of the case diary, it would be evident that the appellant has cooperated with the police and, in fact, a special investigation team was constituted for tracing out the victim which had also visited Gujarat and came to the conclusion that the victim was staying with some other person in Gujarat itself. Learned counsel adds that the appellant is in custody since 23.05.2026.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

It appears from the confessional statement of the appellant, which has been relied upon by the learned counsel for the appellant, and there is no doubt about the fact that the appellant herself admitted to have taken away the victim to Gujarat, and she has further stated that from the station, the victim had become traceless. There does not appear to be any effort made by the appellant to register any complaint on account of the victim having become traceless and, in fact, the statements of the witnesses do reveal that the appellant was instrumental in alluring and enticing away the victim to Gujarat, where it is alleged that she was sold to some other person.

Regard being had to the aforesaid facts, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, her prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

08.09.2026
Umesh-Abhishek/-