

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 6137 of 2026

Bimal Kumar Das @ Bimal Das, S/O- Late Bablu Das
... .. Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rahul Ranjan, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Abhay Kr. Tiwari, APP

02/10.07.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 30.08.2025 in connection with Deoghar Cyber P.S. Case No. 121 of 2025 (Cyber Crime Case No. 151/25), registered under Sections 111(2)(6), 111(3), 111(4), 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and sections 66B, 66C, 66D and 84(C) of Information Technology Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-Cum-Special Judge Cyber Crime Cases, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier on 08.04.2026 in B.A. No. 11669 of 2025. He submits that although in the order rejecting bail to the petitioner, it was mentioned that the petitioner has two other antecedents, but he has taken instructions that the petitioner has one criminal antecedent which has come in the First Information Report itself.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the trial has commenced.

5. To this, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that as per the impugned order dated 27.05.2026, out of 11 witnesses, none of the witnesses have been examined.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the fact that the bail application of the petitioner was

rejected earlier on merits, it would make no difference as to how many antecedents are there and during the course of argument itself, it is not in dispute that the petitioner has at least one antecedent. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. However, there can be no reason for non-production of witnesses by the State.

8. The State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the learned court.

9. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution and Superintendent of Police of the concerned district 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:10.07.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:11.07.2026