

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 5091 of 2026

Fatu Tudu @ Ramesh Tudu, son of Sri Bhaskar Tudu
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Manoj Kr. Dash, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shashi Kr. Verma, APP

- 02/19.06.2026 Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.09.2025 in connection with S.T. No.471 of 2025, arising out Galudih P.S. Case No.26/2025, registered under Sections 64 (1) & 69 of BNS, but the charge has been framed for the offence under Section 64 (2) (m) of BNS, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge – I, Ghatshila.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.09.2025 and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that on the face of the FIR itself, it appears that there was love relationship between the victim and the petitioner, and subsequently, she became pregnant, and thereafter, she alleged that the petitioner has committed rape upon her in false pretext of marriage. The learned counsel submits that no case is made out against the petitioner.
4. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail. He has submitted that as per the impugned order, the trial is going on and out of 8 charge sheeted witnesses, 2 witnesses have already been examined.
5. At this, upon the query of this Court, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the victim has not been examined so far.
6. It appears that after investigation, charge has been framed for offence under Section 64 (2) (m) of BNS in alternative under Section 69 of BNS.

7. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the fact that the trial is going on and the victim has not yet been examined by the court so far, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

8. However, the State is directed to ensure that the remaining witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

9. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned district and also to Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

10. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: 19.06.2026

Saurav

Date of Uploading: 19.06.2026