

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 2454 of 2026

Arpit Sharma @ Arpit, aged about 19 years, Son of Sri Anil Kumar Sharma, Resident of 549/65, Bara Barhaa Alambagh, PS. Alambagh, PO Alambagh, Benti, District-Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh-226005.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand.

... .. Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD

For the Petitioner : Mr. Neelam Kumari, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Satish Kumar Keshri, APP

03/Dated: 25th March, 2026

1. The instant application has been filed under Sections 483 and 484 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for grant of bail in connection with Chirkunda P.S. Case No. 169 of 2025 corresponding to POCSO Case No. Spl (P) 110 of 2025, registered under Section 96 of the BNSS, 2023 and Sections 8 and 12 of the POCSO Act, 2012; and charge-sheet has been submitted under Section 87, 96, 64(2)(m) 65(1) of the BNS and under Section 6 of the POCSO Act and charge has been framed under Section 87 of the BNS and Section 6 of the POCSO Act pending in the court of learned Special Judge POCSO Act, Dhanbad.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that he has been implicated in this case.

3. The petitioner has been custody since 05.08.2025. The case is at the stage of evidence and seven witnesses have already been examined and there are material contradictions in the statements of the prosecution witnesses. Furthermore, even there is no conclusive piece of evidence with respect to age of the victim and the principal of the school has not been examined wherefrom the certificate has been issued.
4. Therefore, submission has been made that the present petitioner may be enlarged on bail.
5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the opposite party-State has seriously opposed the prayer for grant of bail and submitted that the trial is in progress and out of 11 witnesses 7 witnesses have already been examined who have supported the case of the prosecution.
6. This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties.
7. The petitioner is named in the FIR, against whom there is direct allegation that he enticed away the victim girl, who was aged about 16 years at the time of occurrence. Further, mobile location of the petitioner was found near that place.
8. So far trial is concerned, as per impugned order, out of 11 witnesses 7 witnesses have been examined, who have fully supported the case of the prosecution. The

prosecution witnesses have deposed that the petitioner took the victim away and told her that he would provide job and on that pretext, he established physical relation with her repeatedly in Haridwar and Madhya Pradesh.

9. This Court, considering the nature of crime which is heinous in nature and further taking into consideration the fact that substantial number of witnesses have been examined, is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

10. Accordingly, the instant bail application stands rejected.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

25th March, 2026
Alankar/-