IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8784 of 2026

Saddam Ansari, aged about 36 years, S/O - Ayub Mian, R/O Village - Barmatra, P.O +P.S. -Sarwan, District - Deoghar.

… … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rahul Ranjan, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shailendra Kr. Tiwari, Spl. PP

08/**08.10.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with Cyber P.S. Case No.91 of 2026, registered under Sections 111(2)(b), 111(3), 111(4), 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (B.N.S.), 2023, along with Sections 66(B),66(C),66(D) and 84(C) of the Information Technology (I.T.) Act, now pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum-Special Judge, Cyber Crime Cases, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner has a criminal antecedent of similar nature in which he has been enlarged on bail, but so far as the present case is concerned, 1 mobile phone and 2 SIM cards are alleged to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, no victim has been identified and no crime link has been found. He has further submitted that charge sheet has been submitted and therefore the petitioner may be enlarged on bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that though charge sheet has been submitted, but further investigation is still going on. It has come to light in paragraph 41 of the case diary, different mobile phones and different SIM cards were used and e-wallets were generated. So far as the seized mobile phone and SIM Cards are concerned, they are not in the name of the

petitioner.

5. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that 1 SIM card is in the name of the petitioner and the mobile phone and other SIM card are in the name of 3rd person which have been falsely planted upon the petitioner.

6. Considering the fact one mobile phone and one SIM card recovered from the possession of the petitioner are standing in the name of another person and multiple mobile phones and SIMs were alleged to have been used with respect to the seized articles as mentioned in the case diary and multiple e-wallets were also found and further investigation is still going on in connection with organized crime and the petitioner also has a criminal antecedent of a similar nature, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, this bail application is rejected.

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the learned court concerned through "FAX/email".

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

*Date of Order:**08.10.2026***
Saurav
Date of Uploading:08.10.2026