

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 6546 of 2026

Jaleshwar Mahto, aged about 23 years, son of Lakhan Mahto @
Lakhan Lal Mahto, resident of village-Kansidih, P.O.-Baburamdih,
P.S.-Tamar, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

07/09.09.2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner and the State is present.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 12.10.2025 in connection with S.T. No.07 of 2026 (arising out of Tamar P.S. Case No.110/2025), for the alleged offence registered under Section 70(1) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, pending in the court of learned Additional Judicial Commissioner-XII, Ranchi.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the victim has been partly examined before the court and she is yet to be cross-examined. He has further submitted that co-accused, namely Umesh Mahto, has been enlarged on bail by this Court in B.A. No. 2645 of 2026 vide order dated 06.05.2026, primarily on the ground that he was not put under TIP. Another co-accused, namely Tulsidas Mahto, has also been enlarged on bail by this Court in B.A. No. 3520 of 2026 vide order dated 06.05.2026 on a similar ground. He has further submitted that one more co-accused, namely Mastan Kumar Mahto, has also been enlarged on bail by this Court in B.A. No. 4363 of 2026 vide order dated 07.07.2026 on the ground that he was also not put under TIP. Learned counsel has submitted that the bail application of co-accused, namely Manoj Puran, was rejected by this Court in B.A. No. 5465 of 2026 vide order dated 07.07.2026, as he was named in the First Information Report.

4. Learned counsel has submitted that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report nor TIP was conducted. Therefore, the case of the petitioner is similarly situated to that of the co-accused who have been enlarged on bail.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the victim is still being examined before the court and, at this stage, the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the arguments of the learned counsel for the parties and since the victim is still being examined and it is a case of gang rape and in the statement of victim recorded under Section 183 BNSS, she has stated that she could identify the accused persons, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

7. The instant bail application is hereby **rejected**.

8. ***However, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after 6 months.***

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)