

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 583 of 2025

....
Aryan Giri Son of Ganesh Giri, aged about 20 years, resident of
Argoda, PO + PS-Argoda, District- Ranchi **Appellant**
Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. xxxx **Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRASAD

For the Appellant : Mr. Pratik Sen, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bishambhar Shastri, A. P. P.
For the Resp. No. 2 : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Ravi, Advocate

.....
OPEN ORDER IN COURT

....
05/14.11.2025 The Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 583 of 2025 has been filed on behalf of the appellant under Section 14 (A) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 2015 by challenging the order dated 19.05.2025 passed by Sri Vishal Srivastava, learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Ramgarh in MCA No. 351 of 2025 arising out of Mandu (Kujju) P.S. Case No. 20 of 2025 corresponding to SC/ST Case No. 10 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 69, 3(5), 126 (2), 115(2), 352, 351 (3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3 (1)(s) of the SC/ST (POA) Act by which the prayer for bail of the appellant has been rejected.

2. As per the FIR, the appellant is alleged to have married with the Informant on 26.11.2024 in a Temple at Jamshedpur. However, she was not liked by the family members of the appellant. It is alleged that the appellant has snatched the mobile phone of the Informant and forcibly established physical relationship in a Hotel and when she put pressure upon the

appellant to marry with her, then he refused to marry with her and abused her and snatched Rs. 5,000/- cash.

3. Heard learned counsel for the appellant, learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Informant-Respondent no. 2.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the impugned order passed by the learned Court below is illegal and not sustainable in eye of law. It is submitted that the allegations against the appellant are false and concocted. It is submitted that the appellant has not abused the Informant in the name of her caste. It is submitted that the appellant has performed marriage with the Informant on 26.11.2024 even against the wishes of his family members and is ready to keep her with full honour and dignity. It is submitted that the appellant is in custody since 26.02.2025 and hence, the appellant may be enlarged on bail.

5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail.

6. Although, learned counsel for the Informant-Respondent no. 2 has also opposed the prayer for bail, but has submitted that the appellant may be directed to keep the Informant with full honour and dignity.

7. Perused the records of this case and case diary and considered the submissions of both the sides.

8. It appears from FIR that the appellant had performed marriage with the Informant-Respondent No. 2 and has established physical relationship with her.

9. From perusal of the case diary, it appears that the Informant during her subsequent statement has stated that the appellant has solemnized married with her on 26.11.2024 in a

Temple at Jamshedpur and abused her in the name of her caste.

10. Even confessional statement of the appellant that he has performed marriage with the Informant in a Temple.

11. The appellant is also ready to keep the Informant with full honour and dignity.

12. It appears that the appellant is in custody since 26.02.2025 i.e. for more than eight (08) months.

13. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the custody of the appellant and considering the submission of the appellant made before this Court, the appellant-Aryan Giri is directed to be released on bail, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.15,000/- (Fifteen thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Sri Vishal Srivastava, learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Ramgarh/or his Successor Court in connection with Mandu (Kujju) P.S. Case No. 20 of 2025 corresponding to SC/ST Case No. 10 of 2025.

However, the appellant should keep endeavour to keep the Informant with full honour and dignity.

14. Accordingly, the Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 583 of 2025 is allowed and the impugned the order dated 19.05.2025 passed by Sri Vishal Srivastava, learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Ramgarh in MCA No. 351 of 2025 arising out of Mandu (Kujju) P.S. Case No. 20 of 2025 corresponding to SC/ST Case No. 10 of 2025 is, hereby, set aside.

15. Thus, the Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 583 of 2025 is allowed and stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Prasad, J.)

Dated 14.11.2025
Kamlesh/