

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**B.A. No. 3548 of 2026**

|                                    |     |     |                   |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------|
| Ajay Nayak, son of late Raju Nayak | ... | ... | <b>Petitioner</b> |
| Versus                             |     |     |                   |
| The State of Jharkhand             | ... | ... | <b>Opp. Party</b> |

**CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Parwez Ahmad Khan, Advocate  
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Achinto Sen, APP

03/28.04.2026 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 S.T. Case No. 62 of 2025, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 20 of 2025 arising out of Hatgamharia P.S. Case No. 26 of 2024 for the offences registered under Sections 64(1) and 332(b) of the B.N.S. 2023, pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum-Special Judge, POCSO Act Cases, West Singhbhum at Chaibasa.

**3.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 04.12.2024 and charge has been framed in this case on 08.04.2025 but still the trial has not concluded. He submits that victim is a married woman and out of 9 prosecution witnesses, a few witnesses have been examined and has fairly submitted that the victim has not been examined.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the petitioner was apprehended on the spot. He further submits that the trial may be expedited.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation against the petitioner and the petitioner was apprehended on the spot, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, there can be no reason for the State not to produce the witnesses before the court.

7. The State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court so that the trial may be taken to a logical end.

8. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director Prosecution and the Superintendent of Police of the concerned District to ensure compliance.

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

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

Dated: 28.04.2026

Uploaded on: 29.04.2026

Binit/