

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8479 of 2026

Dilip Saw @ Tuntun aged about 61 years, S/O Late Ramvilash Saw,
resident of Ramua, Vishnugarh, P.O. & P.S.- Vishnugarh, District-
Hazaribagh. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Ms. Pragati Prasad, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Ms. Lily Sahay, APP

04/16.09.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 04.05.2026 in connection with Bishnugarh P.S. Case No. 58 of 2026, registered under Sections 74, 75 & 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and sections 8 and 12 of POCSO Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, IV-cum-Spl. Judge, POCSO, Hazaribagh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner happens to be a bus conductor and he has been falsely implicated on the allegation of sexually assaulting the girl aged 10 years. She submits that it is alleged that the petitioner had given chocolate to the girl and taken her away and then, sexually assaulted her.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the place where the girl was alleged to have been taken, is a public place and the incident is of 02.05.2026 at 08 p.m. and therefore, there is no likelihood of committing any such offence in public place. She has also submitted that there is no eye-witness to the alleged occurrence.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party- State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner and it has also come that the petitioner has been sexually assaulting the girls in the locality.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail as the victim and other material witnesses are yet to be examined before the learned court. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through 'FAX/e-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:16.09.2026

Pankaj

Date of Uploading:16.09.2026