IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 11663 of 2025

Sonu Saurav, aged about 24 years, Son of Pappu Kumar Das, Resident of Village Baghmara, P.O. and P.S. Jasidih, District Deoghar, Jharkhand. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arvind Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Naveen Kumar Ganjhu, Advocate

04**/16.03.2026**

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 04.08.2025 in connection with Cyber Crime Case No. 133 of 2025 corresponding to Deoghar (Cyber) P.S. Case No. 108 of 2025, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 111(2)(b), 111(3), 111(4), 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) & 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 66(B), 66(C), 66(D) & 84(C) of the Information Technology Act pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum- Special Judge, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He has also submitted that the mobile and the SIM have been implanted upon the petitioner by the police to make an allegation of Cyber offence.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the petitioner also has criminal antecedent of similar nature and in the case diary, the use of mobile and SIM by the petitioner has been given in details. He has also submitted that the victim has also come forward to support the allegation against the petitioner.

5. At this, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is only one victim.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the allegations and also that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent and the victim has supported the case of the prosecution, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

16.03.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-17.03.2026