

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.10010 of 2025

Sunil Lohra, aged about 29 years, S/o Late Sukra Lohra, R/o
Village Simhatu, Lohra Toli, P.O. & P.S. Mahabuang, District
Simdega (Jharkhand). Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

With

B.A. No.10212 of 2025

Kush Lohra, Aged about 20 years, S/o Manglu Lohra, R/o
Simhatu, Lohratoli, P.O. & P.S. Mahabuwang, District Simdega,
Jharkhand Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

With

B.A. No.11467 of 2025

Siroj Lohra, aged about 26 years, son of Late Prakash Lohra,
Resident of Village Simhatu Lohra Toli, P.O. & P.S. Mahabuwang,
District Simdega (Jharkhand). Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner(s)	: Mr. Kripa Shankar Nanda, Advocate [In B.A. No.10010 of 2025] Mr. Mohit Prakash, Advocate Mr. Vishal Srivastava, Advocate [In B.A. No.10212 of 2025] Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate [In B.A. No.11467 of 2025]
For the State	: Mr. Tarun Kumar, Addl.P.P [In B.A. No.10010 of 2025] Mr. Arup Kumar Dey, Addl.PP [In B.A. No.10212 of 2025] Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, Addl.PP

[In B.A. No.11467 of 2025]

Order No.03 Dated- 16-02-2026

Heard the parties.

Since all three bail applications have been filed in connection with same case, hence all these three bail applications are disposed of by this common order.

The petitioners have been made accused in connection Mango POCSO Case No.18 of 2025 arising out of Bano P.S. Case No.39 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 96, 70(1), 351(2), 351(3), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and under Sections 4, 6 and 8 of the POCSO Act, pending in the Court of learned Special Judge (POCSO), Simdega after framing of charge.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners have committed gang rape upon the prosecutrix. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioners is false. It is then submitted that the prosecutrix in her statements recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S. has named the petitioner Siroj Lohra to be one of the persons, who ravished her along with two others but the petitioners namely Sunil Lohra and Kush Lohra have not been named by the prosecutrix. It is next submitted that in para 13 of B.A. No.10010 of 2025 and in para 8 of B.A. No.11467 of 2025, it has been mentioned that the charge-sheet has been submitted against the petitioners without any T.I. Parade being conducted only on the basis of the confessional statement of co-accused Siroj Lohra. It is next submitted that all the petitioners have been in custody since 16.06.2025. It is next submitted that there is delay of one month in lodging of the F.I.R. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be released on bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is every chance of the accused person Siroj Lohra absconding and tampering with the evidence, if are released on bail in view of the serious nature of allegations made against Siroj Lohra and as he has been named in the statement recorded under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S. of the victim.

Considering the facts that the petitioners namely Sunil Lohra in B.A. No.10010 of 2025 and Kush Lohra in B.A. No.10212 of 2025 have not been named by the prosecutrix either in the FIR or in the statement recorded under Sections 183 of the B.N.S.S. and without putting them in T.I. Parade, charge sheet has been submitted. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners namely Sunil Lohra and Kush Lohra on bail. Accordingly, the petitioners namely Sunil Lohra and Kush Lohra are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Judge POCSO, Simdega with the condition that they will co-operate with the trial of the case, furnish their mobile number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card in the court below with an undertaking that they will not change their mobile number during the trial of the case.

So far as the petitioner namely Siroj Lohra in B.A. No.11467 of 2025 is concerned, he has been named in the statement under Section 183 of the B.N.S.S. of the victim. Hence, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner namely Siroj Lohra on bail at this stage in view of the serious nature of allegations against him, as also the chance of his absconding and tampering with the evidence, if released on bail.

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

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 16.02.2026/

Madhav/-

Uploaded on:17/02/2026