

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 2999 of 2026

Ajay Oraon @ Ajay Linda, S/o: Jakriash Linda @ Indrasan Oraon
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Ms. Nidhi Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Mr. Someshwar Roy, Advocate

04/13.04.2026

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 23.12.2024 in connection with POCSO Case No. 15 of 2025 arising out of Chauparan P.S. Case No. 115 of 2024, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 363, 366(A) of the Indian Penal Code and the charge has been framed under section 363, 366, 376, 376(2)(n) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 4 & 6 of the POCSO Act pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-III-cum-Special Judge POCSO, Hazaribag.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge has been framed on 09.04.2025, but witnesses are not being examined and there are 9 charge sheeted witnesses. She has also submitted that there is unexplained delay of 12 days in registering the First Information Report.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner that the victim had been to mela and from there she was kidnapped by the petitioner and thereafter, the further offence of rape was committed and the petitioner talked to her regarding marriage. He has also submitted that the victim was minor and aged about 17 years. However, the learned counsel for the State is not able to explain as to why the witnesses are not being produced. He has

submitted that the impugned order has been passed on 15.05.2025 and in the meantime a few witnesses must have been examined.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the seriousness of allegation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

7. However, the State is directed to ensure prompt production of witnesses.

8. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution as well as Superintendent of Police of the concerned district to ensure compliance.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

13.04.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-14.04.2026