

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 9585 of 2025

Md. Islam @ Bali, aged about 29 years, S/o Md. Santar
... .. **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Nityanand Prasad, Advocate
For the Opp. Party-State : Ms. Sushma Aind, Addl. P.P.

05/19.06.2026

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 09.02.2022 in connection with S.T. No. 289 of 2022 arising out of Dumka (M) P.S. Case No. 204 of 2021 corresponding to G.R. No. 773 of 2022, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 302/34, 201, 120(B) of Indian Penal Code and charge has been framed under Section 376D, 302/34, 201/34, 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II, Dumka.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the co-accused has been enlarged on bail vide order dated 13.10.2023 in B.A. No. 6019 of 2023, who was the husband of the victim. Learned counsel has further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case in view of the fact that on date of first information report and also on 21.10.2021, the petitioner was in judicial custody in connection with another FIR. The learned counsel for the petitioner is not aware as to how many witnesses has been examined so far and what is the stage of the case.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and referred to the counter affidavit and has submitted that DNA profile of the petitioner has been found

matching with that of the victim and as per the FIR the incident had happened a few days earlier.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the seriousness of alleged offence , aforesaid facts and circumstances and the counter affidavit as pointed out by the learned counsel for the State, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

6. The instant bail application is accordingly rejected.

7. However, there can be no reason for the State not to produce the witnesses particularly when the petitioner is in custody since 09.02.2022. The State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produce before the court.

8. Learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Director, Prosecution as well as Superintendent of Police of the concerned district.

9. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

19.06.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-19.06.2026