

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 1498 of 2026

Faijan Ansari @ Md. Faijan Raza @ Md. Faijaan,
Son of Mahoruddin Miyan @ Maharuddin Ansari

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... .. **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Atanu Banerjee, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sailendra Kumar Tiwari, Spl. PP
For the Informant : Mr. Zaid Ahmed, Advocate

06/15.05.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 09.10.2025 in connection with S.T. No. 367 of 2025 arising out of B.T.P.S. P.S. Case No. 67 of 2025, for the offences registered under Sections 64 (2) (m) & 351 (2) of the B.N.S. 2023, pending in the court of learned, Learned Additional Sessions Judge-II (F.T.C.), Bermo at Tenughat.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. As per the allegation, the victim became friendly with the petitioner through Instagram and the petitioner established consensual relationship. When the petitioner established physical relationship with the victim, it was captured through video etc. and then the petitioner started blackmailing her that the video would be made viral and subsequently the petitioner was made an accused in this case. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FSL report has not yet come.

4. Learned counsel for the informant has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that there are two similar cases lodged against the petitioner and the allegation are very serious.

5. The learned counsel for the State has submitted that video etc. has been procured in pen drive and it has been sent to FSL. But the FSL report has not yet been received.

6. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that out of the two cases which has been registered against the petitioner, in

one case he has been granted anticipatory bail and, in another case, he has been granted bail. He submits that both the cases are not of similar nature.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the serious nature of allegation made against the petitioner and the petitioner also has criminal antecedents and the victim has also supported the allegation in her statement recorded under Section 183 BNSS, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is hereby rejected.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 15.05.2026

Uploaded on 16.05.2026

Binit/