

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**B.A. No. 11669 of 2025**

Bimal Kumar Das, son of Bablu Das

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

...

...

Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Nityanand Prasad Choudhary, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shailendra Kumar Tiwari, Spl. PP

03/08.04.2026

Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 30.08.2025 in connection with Deoghar Cyber Crime P.S. Case No.121 of 2025, registered under Sections 111(2) (b), 111 (3), 111(4), 319 (2), 318 (4), 338, 336 (3), 340 (2), 61 (2) of B.N.S and Section 66 (B) (C) (D), 84 (C) of I.T. Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge – II – cum – Special Judge, Cyber Crime, Deoghar.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 30.08.2025 and two mobiles and one sim are alleged to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, which are said to be involved in commission of cyber offence. He further submits that though there are two antecedents against the petitioner, but the petitioner has been implicated in this case as well and several co-accused persons have been enlarged on bail.

4. The learned counsel has submitted that the co-accused namely Sudhir Mandal, Ranjeet Das and Alauddin Ansari have been enlarged on bail by co-ordinate Benches of this Court in B.A. No.11439 of 2025, B.A. No. 11558 of 2025 and B.A. No. 11313 of 2025 respectively.

5. The learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the allegation is that of organized crime and one victim has also been identified, who has been defrauded by the petitioner of an amount of Rs. 31,996/-.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the serious nature of offence including organized crime and that the petitioner having two criminal antecedent and one victim has also been identified during investigation , the case of the petitioner does not stand on similar footing as compared to those who have been enlarged on bail by co-ordinate Benches. This Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through “FAX/email”.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order:08.04.2026

Saurav

Date of Uploading:09.04.2026