

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8148 of 2026

Sant Suman Kumar @ Sant Suman Yadav, aged about 31 years, S/o Mahadeo Prasad Yadav, R/o Vill.- Ojadih, P.O- Ojadih, P.S- Bengabad, District- Giridih, Jharkhand - 815312.

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Yuvraj Singh, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Vishwanath Roy, APP

- 07/09.09.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. A counter affidavit has been filed during the court proceedings, which is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 22.09.2025 in connection with Giridih Cyber P.S. Case No. 34 of 2025, registered under Sections 319(2)/ 318(4)/ 338/ 336(3)/340 (2) of the Bhartiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 66(B)/66(C)/66(D) of the Information Technology Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-Cum Spl. Judge (Cyber Crime), Giridih.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that bail application of the petitioner was rejected earlier in B.A. No. 1858 of 2026 vide order dated 09.04.2026. He also submits that the charge has been framed on 21.05.2026, but no witness has been produced so far. The last date before the learned court, as known to him, was on 01.09.2026.
5. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner in connection with the cyber fraud amounting to the extent of Rs. 23 lakhs. As per the counter affidavit produced during the court proceedings, the investigation officer of the case has stated that the next date before the learned court is on 19.09.2026 and all the witnesses are likely to be produced on that day. The learned counsel

submits that 05 of the witnesses have been served notice for their appearance.

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 and considering the readiness on the part of the prosecution to produce the witnesses before the learned court, as mentioned in the counter affidavit and pointed out by the learned counsel for the opposite party, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail and hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. In case the witnesses are not produced, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail after 06 months.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:09.09.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:10.09.2026