

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. (Filing) No.4427 of 2026

XXXX	...	...	Petitioner
	Versus		
The State of Jharkhand	...	...	Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. R.S. Mazumdar, Sr. Advocate
	: Ms. Talat Parween, Advocate
For the Opp. Party	: Mr. Bishambhar Shgastri, APP

04/13.04.2026 Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 19.07.2025 in connection with Special POCSO Case No.116 of 2025, arising out of Bankmore P.S. Case No.172/2025, registered under Sections 75 (2) of BNS and Section 08 of POCSO Act, now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Dhanbad.

3. A supplementary affidavit has been filed to bring on record that the bail application of the petitioner, B.A. No. 8994 of 2025, was rejected earlier by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 03.11.2025. The learned counsel who is on record of this case has submitted that due to inadvertence and bonafide mistake, such fact could not be mentioned in the main bail application. The learned counsel has submitted that such mistake will not be repeated.

4. Considering the aforesaid submissions , the supplementary affidavit is accepted.

5. The case has been argued on merit.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 19.07.2025, charge was framed on 11.12.2025, but there is not much progress in the trial and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case.

7. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer and submitted that the mother of the victim is the informant of the case and the petitioner is the father of the victim. The learned counsel has

further submitted that considering the nature of allegation, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail. However, he has no objection if the trial is expedited.

8. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there is matrimonial discord between the petitioner and his wife, who is the informant of the case, therefore, possibility of false implication cannot be ruled out.

9. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the seriousness of allegation made against the petitioner in connection with his minor daughter and the fact that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

10. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are produced promptly before the Court.

11. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution and also to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned district.

12. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: 13.04.2026

Saurav/-

Date of Uploading: 13.04.2026