

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. App. (DB) No. 660 of 2022

-
1. Manoj Ahir, (Age-26 yrs.), Son of Fulchand Ahir, R/o Vill-Khetli,
P.O. & P.S.-Dumri, Dist.-Gumla
 2. Sukhram Ahir (Age-32 Yrs.), Son of Ramsay Ahir, R/o-Vill-Ratasili,
P.O. + P.S.-Dumri, Dist.-Gumla
- Appellants**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellants	: Mr. A.K. Das, Advocate
For the State	: Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Spl.PP

Order No. 09/ Dated: 04th May, 2026

I.A. No. 3033 of 2026

1. Heard Mr. A.K. Das, learned counsel for the appellant No. 1 and Learned Spl.P.P.
2. This application has been preferred by the appellant No. 1 for grant of bail to him, during the pendency of this appeal.
3. The prayer for bail of the appellant No. 1 was earlier rejected thrice.
4. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant No. 1 that the father of the victims who has been examined as P.W.-2 has stated that the name of the appellants were disclosed to him by the police. It has been submitted that there is no proper identification of the appellants as the persons who had committed the offence upon the victims and no T.I.P. has been held. Referring to the evidence of one of the victims who has been examined as P.W.-1, submission has been advanced that for the first time in the dock she had identified the appellant No.1 as one of the persons having committed rape upon her. It has further been submitted that though the victims have stated that they

have been dragged by the appellants and subjected to rape but the medical report does not suggest of any injuries found on the person of the victims. Learned counsel adds that the appellant No. 1 is in custody since 15.06.2022.

5. Learned Spl.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant No. 1.

6. It appears from the evidence of the victims who have been examined as P.W.-1 and P.W.-3 that these appellants had committed rape upon them. So far as medical examination is concerned, the same was conducted after four days of the incident.

7. Regard being had to the aforesaid, we are not inclined to reconsider the prayer for bail of the appellant No. 1, which stands rejected, once again.

8. The aforesaid I.A. stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

04.05.2026

Basant

Uploaded on 06/05/2026