IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 7102 of 2025

1. Pramod Yadav @ Pramod Gope, aged about 34 years, son of Jugeshwar Gope
2. Sunny Yadav @ Sunni Yadav, aged about 27 years, son of Mitraj Yadav
Both are residents of Village Manduikhurd, P.O. & P.S. Lohsinghna, Dist.-Hazaribag **... Petitioners**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand **... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Ms. Jyoti Kumari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, A.P.P.

03/30.04.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Lohsinghna P.S. Case No.52 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 74, 115(2), 117(2), 304, 351(2), 126(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 8/12 of the POCSO Act, pending in the Court of the learned A.D.J.-III cum Spl. Judge, POCSO, Hazaribag.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners and informant are neighbours. She further submits that false allegations are made of outraging the modesty of the victim. She submits that in view of that, anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that serious allegations are there in the FIR and the petitioners are named accused. He also submits that the victim has reiterated the crime under Sections 180 and 183 of the BNSS. On these grounds, he submits that the prayer for anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Looking into the contents of the FIR, it transpires that there are serious allegations against the petitioners of molestation of a girl, who is said to be 16 years of age. In the case diary, statement of the victim has been recorded under Sections 180 and 183 of the BNSS, wherein, she has supported the case.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and, as such, their prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 30th April, 2026
Ajay/