

THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Criminal Appeal (DB) No. 275 of 2026

Ranjit Kumar @ Ranjit Das @ Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Das ... Appellant

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

...

Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant : Mr. Nagmani Tiwari, Advocate

Mr. Amit Kr. Verma, Advocate

Mr. Govind Ray Karan, Adv

For the State : A.P.P.

For the Informant : Mr. M. B. Lal, Advocate

Order No. 04

Dated 07th May, 2026

I.A. No. 5093 of 2026

Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties.

This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

The appellant has been convicted for the offence u/s 87 of the BNS and Section 6 of the POCSO Act and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for twenty years along with a fine of Rs. 20,000/- for the offence u/s 6 of the POCSO Act.

It has been alleged that the daughter of the informant was enticed away by appellant.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the victim has been examined as PW-1 and she has given a completely different version than what was stated by her in her 183 BNSS statement. Learned counsel further submits that PW-1 as per the 183 BNSS statement had left with the appellant for Delhi on her own sweet will, but subsequently in her evidence as PW-1 she has stated about the appellant making her senseless by mixing some intoxicant in sweets and thereafter committing rape upon her and making a video of the same. It has further been submitted that as per the medical report, the age of the victim has been assessed to be more than 19 years. Learned counsel submits that the appellant was all along on bail during trial.

Learned APP as well as the learned counsel for the informant have opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

Mr. M.B. Lal, learned counsel for the informant has copiously referred to the evidence of PW-1 while submitting that it was the appellant who had intoxicated the victim and had committed rape upon her and thereafter taken her to Delhi. Learned counsel further adds that as per school certificate, the date of birth of the victim is 03.08.2008 and the incident is alleged to have taken place on 12.09.2024 which means that the victim was aged 16 years 01 month at the time of the incident. To this Mr. Tiwari, learned counsel for the appellant submits that there is no basis of recording the date of birth as 03.08.2008 in the school documents.

On consideration of the narration made in the First Information Report from which it also appears that ornaments worth Rs. 3 Lakhs were taken away by the victim and in her 183 BNSS statement she has shown her willingness to elope with the appellant but in her evidence during trial as PW-1, she has given a completely different version from what was stated by her earlier, we are inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, during pendency of this appeal, the appellant is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rs. Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned trial court [Special Judge (POCSO Act), Dhanbad] in connection with Special POCSO Case No. 145 of 2024.

This I.A. stands allowed and disposed of.

(RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY, J.)

(PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA, J.)

07.05.2026
MK