

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 3438 of 2026

Samad Ansari @ Sahmat Ansari, son of Kasim Mian
... .. Petitioner
Versus
State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kaushik Sarkhel, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shailendra Kr. Tiwari, Spl. P.P.

04/01.05.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 03.04.2025 in connection with Jamtara Cyber Crime P.S. Case No. 26 of 2025 corresponding to Cyber case no. 70 of 2025, registered under Sections 111(2)(ii), 317(2), 317(4), 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 66(B)(C)(D) of the Information Technology Act, now pending in the court of learned Special Judge, Cyber Crime, Jamtara.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the bail application of the petitioner was earlier dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 09.09.2025 in B.A. No. 6228 of 2025 and thereafter, on 17.02.2026, bail application of the petitioner was rejected. However, there was a direction upon the State to ensure prompt production of witnesses. The learned counsel submits that thereafter the petitioner again moved the learned court with a prayer for bail and the learned court passed the impugned order dated 25.03.2026 rejecting the prayer for bail and the impugned order reveals that the last witness was examined on 17.02.2026.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that out of 15 witnesses, only two witnesses have been examined so far.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the impugned order itself reveals that on 17.02.2026 itself, one witness was examined. He submits that the impugned order is dated 25.03.2026 and nothing has

been mentioned as to what was the next date in the case and as to whether any witness was produced or not after 25.03.2026.

6. Considering the fact that the case of the petitioner has been recently rejected on 17.02.2026 asking the State to promptly produce the witnesses, no fresh ground for bail is made out and accordingly, 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:30.04.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:04.05.2026