2026:JHHC:30133

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 9307 of 2026

Sunil Kumar, Aged about 46 years, S/O- Narayan Lal Das, R/O- House No. 278, Samanto Kali Mandir, P.O + P.S-Jhumri Telaiya, District-Koderma **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The Anti- Corruption Bureaus through the State Of Jharkhand **… … Opp. Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. P.P.N. Roy, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Pratiush Lala, Advocate

For the Opp. Party-ACB : Mr. Vineet Kumar Vashishtha, Advocate

---

05/8th October 2026

1. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody in connection with ACB HZB P.S. Case No. 04/2026 for the offence registered under Section 7(a) of Prevention of Corruption Act, now said to have been pending in the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum-Spl. Judge Vigilance, Hazaribag.

2. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner is alleged to have been trapped with bribe money, but the petitioner has no role to play in the matter relating to refund of the security money. The complainant had filed an application for disconnection of his electricity line and for adjustment of electricity bill amount, but no application has been filed for refund. After the petitioner was apprehended, he was taken to his office and it was found that the file was with the Computer Operator and not with the petitioner and therefore otherwise also, the petitioner was not dealing with the file and therefore no offence is at all made out.

3. During the course of hearing, it transpired that charge-sheet has been submitted on 17.07.2026, but cognizance has not been taken awaiting sanction.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party-ACB has submitted that as per the provision of Section 19 of Prevention of Corruption Act, a timeline has been provided for application of mind by the sanctioning authority, which is a period of three months + one month. He submits that the timeline is yet to expire and the petitioner has been caught in a trap case with bribe money, he may not be enlarged on bail.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the petitioner has been apprehended with bribe money after completing all the procedure, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Hence, this bail application is hereby ***rejected***.

6. However, liberty is reserved with the petitioner to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge or after six months, whichever is earlier.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 08.10.2026
Uploaded On: 08.10.2026
Mukul/-