

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 3097 of 2026

Sahadev Uraon @ Sahadev Oraon Son of Ganauri Uraon
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
State of Jharkhand **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sidhartha Roy, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, APP

- 04/17.04.2026 Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Cyber Crime Case No.40 of 2025 corresponding to Cyber Crime Police Station Case No. 239 of 2025 for the offences registered under Sections 75,78,79,356(2) of the B.N.S. 2023 and section 66(C) and 67 of the IT Act, 2000 pending in the court of learned A.J.C-II cum Special Judge Cyber Crime, Ranchi.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 06.09.2025 and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He has further submitted that SIM and a mobile phone was recovered from his possession. He has submitted that most of the Sections are bailable in nature. He submits that maximum punishment which has been imposed under Section 75 (1) (iv) is one year. However, during the course of argument, it transpired that so far as other sections are concerned, the prescribed punishments are much more.
4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that on perusal of the case diary, it appears that accused petitioner used a fabricated digital identity to target a female politician who is non other than a sitting MLA. The deliberate use of anonymity to launch abusive and gender-based attacks aggravate the seriousness of the allegations. The conduct of the petitioner strikes the dignity of an individual person.

5. To this, the learned counsel has submitted that there is another FIR arising out of the same offence in which the petitioner has been enlarged on bail by the Sessions Court.

6. This court is of the considered view that, so far as second FIR is concerned, it is for the petitioner to take steps and this bail application is considered only with respect to the present FIR before this court.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the seriousness of offence as indicated by the learned counsel for the state this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

8. The State is directed to promptly produce the witnesses before the court so that the trial may be taken to a logical end.

9. 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.

10. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 17.04.2026

Uploaded on: 18.04.2026

Binit/