IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No. 9454 of 2026

Birju Bauri, aged about 42 years, S/o late Lodu Bauri, R/o East Basuria Indrachowk, 2 Number colony, Dhanbad, P.O. Bhuli, P.S. Katrsa (East Basuria O.P.), District-Dhanbad **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand **… … Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Lukesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Ms. Kumari Rashmi, APP

03/**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 Katras (East Basuria O.P.) P.S. Case No. 162 of 2026, corresponding to G.R. No. 2545 of 2026 for the offences registered under Sections 64 of the BNS 2023, pending in the court of learned S.D.J.M. Dhanbad.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the charge sheet has been submitted in this case and the FIR was lodged on 11.06.2026 after 68 days of the alleged offence which is dated 04.04.2026. He has also submitted that the victim alleged that she is pregnant. The I.O. wanted DNA test to be conducted with respect to the unborn baby and the victim was taken to the hospital for DNA Test, but the doctor asked her to come later on and, in the meantime, she got her child aborted.

4. He submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner appears to be neighbour of the victim, but used to work in the house of the victim. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that place of occurrence is the house of the victim where she is residing with her family members and she has stated that for the last one month, the petitioner has been exploiting her physically which appears to be not true.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite party-State has opposed the prayer for bail and has submitted that there is direct allegation made by the victim against the petitioner who is also the informant of the

case and the petitioner is residing in the neighborhood, therefore the petitioner may not be enlarged on bail.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the direct allegation made against the petitioner by the victim in the FIR and the petitioner happens to be the neighbour of the victim and the victim is yet to be examined before the learned court, therefore at this stage, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bai. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

7. Let this order be communicated to the concerned court through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 08.10.2026
Uploaded on 09.10.2026
Binit/