

B.A. No. 2247 of 2026

Suresh Singh, son of Koili Singh **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mrs. Supriya Dayal, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mrs. Lily Sahay, APP

04/10.04.2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2024 in connection with S.T. Case No.74 of 2025, arising out of Ranka P.S. Case No.15 of 2024, registered under Sections 420 & 376 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67 (A) of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and the charge has been framed under Section 376 (2)(n), 406, 420, 506 of the IPC and under Section 67- A of the I.T. Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge – I, Garhwa.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a report was called for from the concerned court regarding the stage of the trial. She submits that only one witness has been examined way back on 10.07.2025 and thereafter no other witness has been examined and the sole witness so examined has also turned hostile.

4. The learned counsel further refers to the F.I.R. and submits that the victim was already married and when her husband went missing, she had an affair with the petitioner, but he was found to be married, and ultimately, the victim got married to another person. She has further submitted that there is no date with respect to the allegation as to when

the petitioner had gone to her matrimonial home and has threatened the victim that he would make the objectionable video viral. The learned counsel submits that the objectionable video with required certification is also not available in the case diary and the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2024.

5. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer and submitted that though in paragraph 52 of the case diary some whatsapp photo has been mentioned, but there is no certification with respect to the same. However, it is submitted that the victim has supported the allegation under Section 164 Cr.P.C. The other arguments based on the F.I.R. as advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not in dispute.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances and also the fact that the petitioner is in custody since 30.05.2024, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees twenty-five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Additional Sessions Judge – I, Garhwa in connection with S.T. Case No.74 of 2025, arising out of Ranka P.S. Case No.15 of 2024, on the following conditions:

- (i) One of the bailors would be the present *pairvikar* of the petitioner.
- (ii) The other bailor should be his close relative.
- (iii) The petitioner will attend the court on each and every date and on account of even single default, the learned court shall cancel the

bail bond furnished by the petitioner.

(iv) The petitioner will deposit a self-attested copy of his Aadhar Card along with his mobile number before the learned court which he will not change during the pendency of the case without prior permission of the court.

(v) The petitioner shall fully co-operate with the proceedings before the learned trial court.

7. The instant application is allowed with the aforesaid conditions.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through "FAX/email".

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:10.04.2026

Saurav

Date of Uploading:13.04.2026