IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 9079 of 2026

Mustkim Ansari @ Mustakim Ansari, aged about 26 years, son of Usman Miyan, resident of Village Barmatara, P.O. Sonaraithari, P.S. Sarawan, District Deoghar, Jharkhand. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arvind Kr. Choudhary, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Shailendra Kr. Tiwari, Spl. PP

04/**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 Deoghar (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 1 mobile phone is alleged to have been recovered from the possession of the petitioner, only 1 victim has been identified to the extent of Rs.25,000/-, the petitioner has no criminal antecedent and charge sheet has already been submitted.

4. Learned counsel for the State has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that though charge sheet has been submitted, further investigation is still going on. He has referred to paragraph 2 of the case diary to submit that altogether 15 cases of fraudulent transactions connecting the petitioner have been recorded and so far only 1 victim has been identified.

5. He submits that the confessional statement of the petitioner reveals that the fraudulent amount was transferred through vouchers to one Faiyaz Ansari, who used to share to the extent of 50% and it is

a case of organized crime.

6. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the numerous complaints of financial fraud have been found against the petitioner in different states, whose details have been mentioned in paragraph 2 of the case diary as well as the fact that investigation is still going on, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail. Hence, this bail application is rejected.

7. However, the State is directed to ensure that the supplementary case diary relating to further investigation be forwarded to the concerned court.

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