

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (D.B.) No. 626 of 2025

Gopal Verma @ Gopal Kumar Verma ... **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... **Respondent**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant : Mr. Shailesh Kr. Singh, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P.

I.A. No. 10956 of 2025

05/17.09.2025 Heard Mr. Shailesh Kr. Singh, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Pankaj Kumar, learned P.P. for the State.

This interlocutory application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

The appellant has been convicted for the offences u/s 87 of the B.N.S and Section 6 of the POCSO Act and has been sentenced to undergo R.I. for 20 years along with a fine of Rs. 10,000/- for the offence u/s 6 of the POCSO Act.

It has been alleged that the daughter of the informant was taken away by the appellant and when the matter was informed to the Police a search was conducted and the victim was recovered from the house of the appellant. The victim had disclosed that on allurement the appellant had taken the victim to his relatives place and he had also established physical relationship with her.

Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the victim who has been examined as P.W.2 has developed a story as in her 164 Cr.P.C. statement she has not stated about the appellant establishing physical relationship with her. In fact, in her 164 Cr.P.C. statement she has stated that she and the appellant had gone on a motorcycle and when a call came

from the informant, they had returned but the informant had refused to take his daughter back which resulted in the appellant taking away the victim to his house. Learned counsel submits that the appellant works as a Driver on a temporary basis.

Learned P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant and has submitted that the age of the victim has been assessed to be 14-15 years.

In the evidence of the victim who has been examined as P.W.2 it appears that she was enticed away by the appellant and after putting vermilion on her forehead she was subjected to physical relationship on a number of occasions. The medical report also suggests that physical intercourse was established with the victim.

On consideration of the aforesaid facts, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. His prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

I.A. No. 10956 of 2025 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Dated, the 17th September, 2025
A. Sanga/-