

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3208 of 2025

Yashashvi Raj @ Yashasvi Raj, S/o Dr. Rajesh Kumar, R/o Flat Np. RH-21/A, Sector-III, near IIM Hostel, Khelgaon Village, Ranchi, P.O. Hotwar & P.S.- Khelgaon and District- Ranchi and at present resident of Phonenix Officer Mess near Jalakendra Misamari Cantt, P.O., P.S. Sonitpur, Dist- Sonitpur, Assam

... **Petitioner**
Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... **Opposite Party**

WITH
A.B.A. No. 2751 of 2025

Yashashvi Raj @ Yashasvi Raj, S/o Dr. Rajesh Kumar, R/o Flat Np. RH-21/A, Sector-III, near IIM Hostel, Khelgaon Village, Ranchi, P.O. Hotwar & P.S.- Khelgaon and District- Ranchi

... **Petitioner**
Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... **Opposite Party**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Ajit Kumar Sr. Advocate
Ms. Satakchhi Priya Verma, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Tiwari, Spl. P.P.
Mr. Vijoy Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

03/ 10.07.2025 Heard, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioners, and learned State Counsel appearing in respective cases.

2. These anticipatory bail applications under section 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita have been preferred by the same petitioner. In A.B.A. No. 3208 of 2025 he apprehends his arrest in connection with Seraikela (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 01 of 2025, registered for offences punishable under Sections 69, 352, 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the Court of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saraikella whereas in A.B.A. No.2751 of 2025 he apprehends his arrest in connection with R.I.T. P.S. Case No. 98 of 2024, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 504, 506 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, pending in the Court of the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Saraikella

3. In Seraikela (Mahila) P.S. Case No. 01 of 2025 [A.B.A. No. 3208 of 2025] it has been alleged that informant's father shared her photo in a matrimonial WhatsApp group to find a suitable matrimonial alliance. The informant's family and the petitioner's family first spoke and met in Ranchi. Both families decided to hold a destination wedding in Bikaner on 25th and 26th January, and the informant's family paid Rs.21,00,000/- to a wedding planner

for the arrangements. Later, on 2nd July 2024, the petitioner and the informant's daughter met at a resort in Jamshedpur. It has been alleged that the petitioner had physical relations with her under the belief and assurance of marriage. But afterward, the petitioner and his family ceased all contact and refused from marriage. The informant's daughter was blocked, abused, and allegedly threatened.

4. In R.I.T. P.S. Case No. 98 of 2024 [A.B.A. No.2751 of 2025] is the earlier case lodged by the informant out of the same occurrence, wherein it has been alleged that informant's father shared her photo in a matrimonial WhatsApp group to find a suitable matrimonial alliance. The informant's family and the petitioner's family first spoke and met in Ranchi. Both families decided to hold a destination wedding in Bikaner. The informant was asked to send money to Ajay Kumawat's account for wedding arrangements. It is alleged that the petitioner and his mother kept pressurising the informant to pay money and the petitioner told informant to make her father pay or the marriage would be called off. Under pressure, the informant deposited Rs.21,00,000/- to Ajay Kumawat. Later, the petitioner's mother allegedly demanded more jewellery and cash. When this was rejected, the petitioner and his family refused from the marriage and blocked all contact.

5. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence whatsoever as alleged in either of the First Information Reports. He argued that the subsequent First Information Report being Seraikela (Mahila) Police Station Case No.01 of 2025 is also for the same occurrence, but only an afterthought improvement in allegation has been made by the informant by incorporating an allegation that the petitioner had physical relations with the informant under the belief and assurance of marriage. Learned counsel argued that the allegations in both the First Information Report are absolutely false only to harass and humiliate the petitioner and his family. Learned counsel contended that lodging of two separate First Information Report with two different police stations for the same occurrence only with an additional afterthought allegation of physical relation makes the entire allegations to be doubtful.

6. Learned State Counsel representing the State in both these anticipatory bail applications, vehemently oppose the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the investigating officer has collected materials in course of investigation to indicate involvement of the petitioner in the offence. Learned State Counsel refers to paragraphs 6 and 10

of the Case Diary, wherein Investigating Officer has described about the statement of witnesses, who have supported the allegations. Further at paragraphs 74 and 75 of the Case Diary, Investigating Officer has described about the room booked by the petitioner and the victim.

7. I have gone through the available records including the Case Diary in both these cases. I find that both these First Information Reports arose out of the same incident. In R.I.T. Police Station Case No.98 of 2024, there is not even a single whisper of any sexual assault or establishing of any physical relationship on the assurance of marriage, but surprisingly, this allegation of establishing physical relationship was incorporated in Seraikela (Mahila) Police Station Case No. 01 of 2025, which was instituted by the informant on 03.01.2025. It is surprising that when the entire incident and the allegation was already informed to the police on 24.10.2024 without whispering about the physical relationship on the pretext of marriage, then again more or less for the same allegation another police case was instituted subsequently by adding allegation of physical relationship. This conduct of the informant creates a doubt as to whether actually incident had occurred or not and whether the allegation is merely an afterthought. The rest of the allegation is of depositing of money in the account of Event Manager for the purpose of marriage, which ultimately did not materialize.

8. Considering the nature of allegations and the discrepancies in both the First Information Reports, where later on allegation of physical assault has been added and further considering that from the entire allegations, it is quite clear that these are not such cases where custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required, I am inclined to allow both these anticipatory bail applications. The petitioner, above named, is directed to surrender before the Court concerned within four weeks from today and in the event of his surrender and/or arrest, he shall be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the respective satisfaction of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Seraikella and the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Seraikella, in connection with Seraikela (Mahila) P.S. Case No.01 of 2025 and R.I.T. P.S. Case No.98 of 2024 respectively, subject to the condition that one of the bailers in respective cases should be a close relative of the petitioner and other should be a resident of State of Jharkhand, having sufficient landed property in his name or in the name of his ancestors in which he is having share and to that effect, he has to file an affidavit before the Trial Court indicating his share in

the property. Further, the petitioner shall appear before the respective Investigating Officers once in every three weeks till submission of the chargesheet/final report in the respective cases.

9. Both these anticipatory bail applications are, accordingly, allowed.

(Ananda Sen, J.)

Kumar/Cp-03