

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 8525 of 2026

Anu Kumari, aged about 22 years, daughter of Birju Yadav, resident
of Village Lodipur, P.O. Sarwarpur, P.S. Mehandiya, District Arwal
(Bihar) **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Vineet Kumar Vashistha, A.P.P.

04/16.09.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Sukhdeonagar (Pandra O.P.) P.S. Case No. 167 of 2026, for the offences registered under Sections 318(4), 319(2), 61(2) of the B.N.S. 2023, Section 66 (C), D) 43 of I.T. Act, and section 10,11 of the Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2024, pending in the court of learned J.M.F.C.-XXXI, Ranchi.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 10.05.2026 and charge has been framed in this case on 24.08.2026. The petitioner happens to be a lady having child of six months and was giving her examination. There is an allegation that her computer system was hacked for the purposes of committing cyber offence of cheating in the examination process and the mobile and mouse were operating on his own.
4. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that the petitioner was apprehend on the spot while giving the examination and the matter relates to scam regarding conducting of competitive examination. He submits that the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.
5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and in view of the direct allegation made against the petitioner that the petitioner was apprehended on the spot while giving the examination and entire gamut of affairs had happened involving malpractices in the

examination by hacking the computer system with the intention of getting the candidates passed in an unethical manner, it is a case of organized crime, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. However, the State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the learned court.

7. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution and Superintendent of Police of the concerned District to ensure compliance.

8. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 16.09.2026

Uploaded on 17.09.2026

Binit/