

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.6828 of 2025

Deepak Kumar Rana @ Deepak Rana, aged about 25 years, Son of Late Shankar Rana, Resident of Village-Aarapagar, P.O. + P.S. – Chouparan, District- Hazaribagh, State-Jharkhand. ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. Party

Coram: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Petitioner	: Mr. A.K. Kashyap, Sr. Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, Addl. P.P.
For the Informant	: Mr. Rajesh Ranjan Srivastav, Adv.

Order No.06/Dated- 18.09.2025

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has been made an accused in connection with Special P.O.C.S.O. Case No.17 of 2024 arising out of Chouparan P.S. Case No. 472 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 363, 366(A), 376(D)(A) of the Indian Penal Code and Section 6 of the P.O.C.S.O. Act, pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-III-cum-Special Judge, P.O.C.S.O. Act, Hazaribag.

3. As per F.I.R., informant/sister of the victim stating *inter alia* that on 11.12.2023 her sister went missing after going out to relieve herself and despite search efforts, she was not found, filed a missing report. On 14.12.2023, the victim was located and revealed that she had been kidnapped by the petitioner with two others who have taken to an unknown place and raped repeatedly for two days. Later, she was abandoned by the roadside. The accused also threatened the victim with circulation of obscene videos and harm to her family, if she disclosed the incident.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence at all rather he has been falsely implicated in this case. It is further submitted that this is the second regular bail application of the petitioner and earlier his bail application being B.A. No.2245 of 2024 vide order dated 08.07.2024 was rejected on merits by this Court. It is further

submitted that petitioner is languishing in judicial custody since 15.12.2023. Charge-sheet has been submitted against the petitioner and out of 12 charge-sheeted witnesses, only 5 charge-sheeted witnesses have been examined in this case. Petitioner undertakes to cooperate in the trial of the case by remaining physically present as and when required and shall not indulge in any manner in tampering with the prosecution evidences or influencing the witnesses of prosecution. Hence, the petitioner may be extended the privilege of bail.

5. On the other hand, learned Addl. P.P appearing for the State assisted by learned counsel appearing for the informant has vehemently opposed the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner and submitted that there is no fresh ground for entertaining the second bail application which is fit to be dismissed. Hence, petitioner may not be extended privilege of bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegation coupled with the materials available against the petitioner and also in view of the fact that earlier prayer for bail of the petitioner was rejected on merits and no fresh ground has been mentioned except that out of 12 charge-sheeted witnesses only 5 witnesses have been examined and from the report submitted by concerned Trial Court, it appears that the trial is likely to be concluded within a period of four months. In this view of the matter, in the interest of smooth trial of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of bail to the petitioner which stands **rejected**.

7. However, the learned trial court is directed to conclude the trial within four months from the date of receiving of this order, thereafter, petitioner shall be at liberty to renew his bail application, if the trial is not concluded within the aforesaid period.

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)