

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. A. (DB) No. 1366 of 2025

Imran Ansari, aged about 28 years, son of Rafique Ansari, resident of
Murma Sursa (Islam Nagar), P.O. & P.S.-Mandar, District-Ranchi

... .. **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA

For the Appellant : Mrs. Rashmi Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P.

Order No. 03/ Dated: 16th February, 2026

I.A. No. 13598 of 2025

Heard Mrs. Rashmi Kumar, learned counsel for the appellant and
learned P.P.

2. This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of
bail to him, during the pendency of this appeal.

3. The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Sections
363, 366, 370(4) & 376(1) of the Indian Penal Code & Section 6 of the
POCSO Act and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment
for 20 years along with fine of Rs.25,000/- for the offence under Section
6 of the POCSO Act.

4. It has been alleged that the daughter of the informant was
suspected to have been abducted by the appellant.

5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the
appellant that though the incident itself is said to have taken place on
11.05.2019 but the first information report was instituted after an
inordinate delay on 17.08.2021. Learned counsel further submits while

referring to the evidence of victim who has been examined as P.W.-4 that the same would reflect that there was a love affair between the appellant and the victim.

6. Learned P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

7. It seems that as per the medical report, the age of the victim has been assessed to be 18-19 years and at the time of incident, she was between 15-16 years. It further appears from her evidence that she was taken to Lohardaga and thereafter to Delhi where she was subjected to rape by the appellant and only on her return, the first information report was instituted which, in fact, satisfies the delay in filing of the first information report.

8. On consideration of the fact that the victim was a minor and her evidence as P.W.-4, we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the appellant is hereby rejected at this stage.

9. The aforesaid I.A. stands rejected and disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

16.02.2026

Arpit

Uploaded on 17/02/2026