

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1430 of 2026

Jamuna Prasad Jaiswal @ Jamuna Prasad, aged about
66 years, Son of Late Shiv Sah, Resident of ward No.
6, Village- Gharghari, P.O.- Birbal & P.S.- Dhuraki,
Dist.- Garhwa, Jharkhand.

..... ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Jharkhand

..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pankaj Srivastava, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Gautam Rakesh, A.P.P.

03/ 15.06.2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P
for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Dhurki P.S. Case No. 124 of 2025, registered for the offence under
Sections 64(2)(M) and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023,
pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Nagar
Untari, Garhwa.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and the petitioner
is aged about 65 years and the informant is 21 years of age. He next
submits that the allegation of committing rape upon the victim girl is
not correct and further terminating the pregnancy is not true. On these
grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be provided to
the petitioner.

4. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State has opposed the
prayer and submits that serious allegation is there of establishing the
physical relationship with the victim on several times and even the
petitioner has threatened the victim girl not to disclose about the

pregnancy. In the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section 183 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, which is the part of the case diary, she has supported the prosecution case. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may not be provided to the petitioner.

5. Looking into the contents of the statement of the victim girl, it transpires that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of forcibly holding the victim girl and thereafter he has also established the relationship and even the allegation of terminating the pregnancy is also there against the petitioner.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, above named. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated:-15.06.2026
Amitesh/-