

News

A man who said he was set up after protesting loud music on a train has been granted bail by the Jharkhand High Court.



The man is charged with inappropriately touching a woman while traveling by train.

A software engineer who was detained last year after a woman accused him of inappropriately touching her on a train has been granted bail by the Jharkhand High Court [Md. Sajjad Ali vs. The State Of Jharkhand].

Judge Rajesh Shankar noted that the accused, Md. Sajjad Ali, said he was only charged because he had protested the complainant and her friends' loud music playing at night.

"The petitioner is to be released on bail upon providing a bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand) with two sureties of the same amount, each, to the satisfaction of the learned Railway Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Jamshedpur in connection with Tatanagar Rail P.S. Case No.102 of 2025," the court stated after hearing the views of the parties' learned counsel.

In response to the complainant's claim that he had inappropriately touched her breast while she was sleeping, the accused was charged under Sections 76 (assault or use of criminal force to woman with intent to disrobe) and 79 (word, gesture, or act intended to insult modesty of a woman) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS).

Nonetheless, the accused's attorney argued that he was wrongfully charged with the crime. The Court was informed that Ali was riding the Hawrah-Ranchi Express on the day of the alleged incident. His attorney also mentioned that the victim was riding the same train as her friends.

According to Ali's attorney, the woman and her companions might have been stage dancers preparing to perform at a Durga Puja event. He said that his client's request to cease playing loud music at night was the only reason he was wrongfully accused of the crime.

He maintained that even if Ali and the victim and her friends got into a fight, it was untrue to say that Ali had inappropriately touched the girl.

The accused is a software developer in Kolkata with no criminal history, the court was further informed. It was argued that he should be granted bail because he had been in court custody since September 29, 2025.

The court ordered the accused's release notwithstanding the prosecution's opposition to the bail plea. The validity of the complainant's accusations is not addressed in the bail order.

In November 2025, a judge in Jamshedpur denied the bail request, noting that the inquiry was still in its early stages and that the accusations against the accused were grave.

The petitioner/accused guy was represented by advocate Pran Pranay.

Vandana Bharti, an additional public prosecutor, represented the State.

Lawread