

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 8343 of 2026

Sonu Gope @ Arup Chandra Gope, aged about 26 years, Son
of Nimai Gope, Resident of Village Judi Pahari Sonaposh,
P.O. Hensra, P.S. Kowali, District -East Singhbhum,
Jharkhand.

... Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand ... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. K Hari, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Jintendra Pandey, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 09.09.2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has moved this Court for grant of bail in connection with Sessions Trial Case No. 11 of 2026 arising out of Kowali P.S. Case No.39 of 2025 corresponding to G.R. Case No. 1307 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 64(1)/69 of the B.N.S., 2023.

This is the second journey of the petitioner with the prayer for regular bail. Earlier the prayer for regular bail of the petitioner was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 24.02.2026 in B.A. No. 12036 of 2025. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed rape upon the prosecutrix who has been examined as P.W.3 and who has supported the case of the prosecution. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. It is next submitted that in her cross-examination in para-21, the prosecutrix has stated that twice she was ravished by the petitioner and on rest of the time it was consensual. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 13.09.2025, as has been mentioned in paragraph no. 16 of the bail application. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be admitted to bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that there is direct

and specific allegation against the petitioner of committing rape upon the victim on two occasions and the same has been supported by the victim in her deposition in court as P.W.3, therefore, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be admitted to bail.

Considering the direct allegation of serious nature against the petitioner and the chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with evidence, as well as the evidence that has already come on record through the deposition of the prosecutrix as well as other prosecution witnesses, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be admitted to bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected at this stage.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

09.09.2026
Sonu/