

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

**B.A. No. 521 of 2026**

Vishal Yadav @ Vishal Kumar Yadav @ Vishal Kumar, son of  
Balram Yadav ... ... **Petitioner**

## Versus

State of Jharkhand ... **Opposite Party**

— — —

**CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**

— — —

|                    |                                   |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner | : Mr. Lalit Yadav, Advocate       |
|                    | : Mr. Satyanshu Shubham, Advocate |
| For the State      | : Mr. Sanjay Kr. Srivastava, APP  |
| For the Informant  | : Mr. Zaid Ahmed, Advocate        |

— — —

07/07.04.2026 Heard the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 03.12.2025 in connection with Sarwan P.S. Case No. 140 of 2025 registered under Section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and it is alleged in the First Information Report that the petitioner has committed rape upon the victim on false pretext of marriage. It is also alleged that the petitioner had taken the victim to Gujarat where they lived as husband and wife and the victim became pregnant, but the petitioner refused to marry the victim. It has also been alleged that a video was prepared and the petitioner has been blackmailing the victim and has committed repeated rape.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that as per the impugned order itself, in paragraph 25 of the case-diary it has been written by the investigating officer that the doctor had advised that after delivery of womb and after 6 months of the infant, the D.N.A. test will be conducted.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is ready for paternity test.

6. Learned counsels for the opposite party- State and the

informant have opposed the prayer and have submitted that there is direct allegation against the petitioner. They have submitted that if the petitioner is ready for paternity test, he may renew his prayer for bail after the paternity test. They have also submitted that the petitioner may file an application before the learned court for the purposes of paternity test.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage and hence, this bail application is rejected.

8. However, upon conduct of paternity test, the petitioner may renew his prayer for bail.

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

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

*Date of Order:07.04.2026*

*Pankaj*

*Date of Uploading:09.04.2026*