

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 6332 of 2026

Chandra Mohan Mandal, Son of Pramod Kumar Mandal

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... .. **Opp. Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner

: Mr. Rahul Ranjan, Advocate

For the Opp. Party

: Ms. Lily Sahay, Advocate

06/5th August 2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Jamtara Cyber Crime P.S. Case No. 56 of 2025 for the offence registered under Sections 111(2)(b), 111(3), 111(4), 111(7), 317(2), 317(4), 317(5), 318(4), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita and Sections 66(B) (C) and (D) of the Information Technology Act and Section 42(3)(e) of the Telecommunication Act, 2023, now said to be pending in the court of learned Special Judge, Cyber Crime, Jamtara.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 26.08.2025 and his bail application was rejected earlier by this Court in B.A. No. 10615/2025 vide order dated 17.02.2026. The petitioner has renewed his prayer for bail only on account of his period of custody. The charge was framed on 13.03.2026 and there is no much progress in the trial and only three witnesses out of ten were examined till 23.04.2026 and thereafter on numerous dates, the witnesses have not been produced by the prosecution. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent. Two Mobile phones and three SIM cards were alleged to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner and one victim has been identified. The co-accused, namely, Khogen Dan has been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 08.12.2025 in B.A. No. 10027/2025

and bail application of other co-accused, namely, Rohit Kumar Mandal has been rejected by this Court in B.A. No. 6132 of 2026 vide order dated 03.07.2026.

3. Learned counsel for the State while opposing the prayer for bail has submitted that the charge has been framed only on 13.03.2026 and the trial is in progress, inasmuch as, three witnesses out of ten have been examined till 23.04.2026.

4. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the bail application of the petitioner was rejected on merits earlier and that the trial is in progress, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is hereby ***rejected***.

5. However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after three months.

6. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'e-mail/FAX'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 05.08.2026

Uploaded On: 05.08.2026

Mukul/-