

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 1367 of 2024

Sunif Ansari, aged about 36 years, son of Allauddin Ansari, resident of Village – Bethat, Satpara, P.O. & P.S. – Bagru, District – Lohardaga.

..... Appellant

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... Respondent

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

For the Appellant : Mr. Ram Prakash Singh, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Srivastava, A.P.P.

Order No. 04/Dated: 18th September, 2025

I.A. No. 9189/2025

1. Heard Mr. Ram Prakash Singh, learned counsel for the appellant and Mr. Sanjay Kumar Srivastava, learned A.P.P. for the State.
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 offence punishable under Sections 376(1), 342/34, 504/34 and 506/34 of the I.P.C. and has been sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for 20 years along with fine of Rs. 20,000/- for the offence under Section 376(1) of the I.P.C.
4. It has been alleged that the appellant had taken mobile phone of the victim and in course of such transaction, the appellant had bolted the door and had subjected the informant to rape.
5. Submission has been advanced by the learned counsel for the appellant that the evidence of victim, who has been examined as

P.W.-1, clearly reveals that she was well-known to the appellant, therefore, it cannot be said that the physical relationship, which was established, was against her wishes. Learned counsel submits that though the incident is said to have taken place on 03.06.2023, but the first information report was lodged on 15.06.2023 and there is no plausible explanation provided by the victim with respect to delay in instituting the first information report. Learned counsel has also submitted that as per P.W.-1, even after occurrence, she had not informed her in-laws though it is said that after death of her husband, she used to reside at her in-laws house. Learned counsel adds that the appellant is in custody since long.

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

7. Regard being had to the evidence of P.W.-1 and the surrounding circumstances, which has been highlighted by the learned counsel for the appellant, we are inclined to admit the appellant on bail.

8. Accordingly, during the pendency of this appeal, the appellant, named above, is directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Lohardaga, in S.T. No. 163 of 2023.

9. I.A. No. 9189 of 2025 stands disposed of.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Sunil/