IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 8762 of 2026

Suraj Kumar Munda @ Suraj Munda, aged about 31 years, Son of Sawna Munda, resident of Buruhundru, Railway Colony, Goilkera, P.O. Bara, P.S. Goilkera, District West Singhbhum, Jharkhand.
At present R.O. Baskonagar, P.O. +P.S. Adityapur, District Seraikela Kharsawa, Jharkhand. **… … Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
For the Informant : Mr. Rahul Pandey, Advocate
: Ms. Arti Kumari, Advocate

04/**08.10.2026**

1. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 18.02.2026 in connection with S.T. Case No. 529 of 2026 arising out of Nagri P.S. Case No. 207 of 2025, for the alleged offence registered under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 69, 352, 91 of BNS pending in the court of learned Additional Judicial Commissioner-XII, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge sheet has been submitted for the alleged offence registered under Section 69 of the BNS and charge has also been framed only under the said section. However no witness has been examined so far. Learned counsel has submitted that the aunt of the victim has stated that there was a relationship between the petitioner and victim during the period from 2017 to 2022 on the pretext of marriage. Learned counsel has further submitted that, as per the allegation, the petitioner got married to another person in the year 2022 and thereafter, there has been no physical relationship between the petitioner and the victim.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, who also happens to be the victim, has opposed the prayer for bail and has

submitted that, on the one hand, the petitioner established a physical relationship with the victim from 2019 onwards and further physical relationship were established even till 2025 although the petitioner got married in the year 2022. She has submitted that the entire relationship was established on the pretext of marriage and that the victim also got pregnant. She has also submitted that the pregnancy was aborted.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-State has also opposed the prayer for bail.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and upon going through the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of BNSS, this Court finds that the victim has made specific allegation against the petitioner that he established a physical relationship with her from 2019 to 2023-2024 on the pretext of marriage and ultimately one lady came to her along with the petitioner, who said that the petitioner had married her in the year 2022. Considering the fact that the victim and other material witnesses are yet to be examined before the court and there is a direct allegation against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage.

7. The instant bail application is hereby **rejected.**

8. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'FAX/E-mail'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

08.10.2026
Rakesh/-
Uploaded on:-08.10.2026