

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 1801 of 2026

Rajesh Das @ Rajesh Kumar Das, son of Babulal Das @ Narayan Das
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opp. Party**

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shree Nivas Roy, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Shweta Singh, Advocate
For the Informant : Mr. Kamdeo Pandey, Advocate

06/15th April 2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Giridih (M) P.S. Case No. 313/2025 corresponding to POCSO Case No. 151/2025 for the offence registered under Section 137(2)/87/64(1)/65(1) of BNS and Section 4/6 of POCSO Act, now said to have been pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Giridih.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although it is alleged that the victim was 15 years of age, but actually she is major. He has submitted that the victim was found missing from her home and when she returned after couple of days, she alleged that the petitioner had taken her away from her house and had established physical relationship with her forcibly.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS and as mentioned in the impugned order, the victim was in relationship with the petitioner and there was a break-up and in the night of 08.10.2025, the petitioner persuaded victim to open the gate and ultimately she was taken away and exploited. The learned counsel submits that since there was a love affair between the victim and the petitioner, the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.

4. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer and submitted that during investigation, it has come from the school records that the victim was only 15 years of age and therefore consent or love affair has no relevance.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the age of the victim which has been found during investigation and serious nature of allegation, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is rejected.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 15.04.2026

Uploaded On:

Mukul/-