

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**B.A. No. 3002 of 2026**

Sanjay Tanti @ Sanjay Kumar Tanti, Son of Sri Rameshwar Tanti

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... ..

Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Prabhat Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Santosh Kumar Shukla, APP

05/15.04.2026

Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 14.11.2025 in connection with Giridhi Town P.S. Case No. 269 of 2025, registered under Sections 87/137(2)/140(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, POCSO Act, Giridih.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Rather, the story is that the petitioner was having much age gap with the victim and the victim wanted to marry him, which he refused. He submits that as per the statement of the victim, the petitioner had dropped her near Giridih bus stand. The petitioner is 31 years of age and the victim is 14 years of age.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that as per the case lodged by the father of the victim, she departed for school by school van, but did not reach the school. It was alleged in the First Information Report that one toto driver i.e., Sanjay Tanti – the present petitioner, who was in regular talking term with the victim, had taken away the victim with ill intention and ultimately, the victim was caught near the bus stand along with the petitioner. He submits that the petitioner also has criminal antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the State has further submitted that the victim has stated in her statement that the petitioner committed wrong

with her.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner and the fact that the victim and the petitioner were caught near the bus stand at Giridih as is apparent from the impugned order by referring to paragraph 39 of the case-diary, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:15.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:16.04.2026