IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8797 of 2026

Md Samiul Hoque, aged about 34 years, S/o Late Ejabul Hoque, R/o Mandalpara, Nurpur, P.O.- Nurpur, P.S.- Manikchak, District-Malda (West Bengal) **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Sr. Advocate
: Mr. Deepankar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Gautam Rakesh, APP
For the Informant : Mr. Suraj Kishore, Advocate
: Mr. Tejaswa Mohanta, Advocate

07/**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 since 06.04.2026 in connection with Bariyatu P.S. Case No.65/2026, corresponding to S.T. No.513 of 2026, registered under Sections 70 (1), 316 (2), 318 (4), 352 and 351 (2)/(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, now pending in the court of learned AJC XV, Ranchi.

3. Counter affidavit filed during court proceeding is taken on record.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the victim were having love relationship since 2013 and although allegations have been made but the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has no criminal antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the Informant has opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that there are direct and specific allegations against the petitioner. The petitioner initially introduced himself with a different name and it subsequently came to light that the petitioner belongs to a different religion and he has been projecting himself in such a manner as if he has no objection with regard to religion etc. but later on, he insisted upon conversion of the victim to another religion and the victim was forcefully raped and was also threatened .

6. The learned counsel for the informant has also submitted that one W. P. (Cr.) No. 413 of 2026 was filed by the victim wherein it was brought to light that the petitioner was threatening the victim even from jail; pursuant to the order passed in that petition, conference calls from jail have now been blocked.

7. The learned counsel for the State has also opposed the prayer for bail.

8. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and considering the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, this Court is of the view that there are direct and very serious allegations against the petitioner. Further, the victim and other material witnesses are yet to be examined before the learned trial court. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

9. This bail application is accordingly rejected.

10. At this, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that some observation may be made so that the trial is expedited.

11. To this the learned counsel for the informant has submitted that 09.10.2026 is the next date in the case and there is a likelihood that witnesses will be produced before the learned trial court.

12. The State is directed to ensure that the witnesses are promptly produced before the court.

13. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the Superintendent of Police of the concerned district and also to Director, Prosecution to ensure compliance.

14. 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