[2026:JHHC:30029]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No.5595 of 2026

Ankit Kumar, aged about 29 years, S/o- Bijay Pawan @ Bijay Paswan, Sex-Male, Resident of Village-Ketra, P.S.- Fatehpur, Dist-Gaya, Bihar Aadhar No. 662002094987.

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vivek Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bishambhar Shashtri, Addl.P.P.
Mr. Santosh Kumar, Advocate.

Order No:-02 Dated:-07-10-2026

Heard the parties.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with B.T.P.S. Case No. 18 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under Section 69 of the B.N.S., 2023.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner by making promise to marry the informant without intention of fulfilling the same; established sexual relationship with her. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as has been mentioned in paragraph no.13 of the anticipatory bail application. It is then submitted that the petitioner undertakes to furnish sufficient security amount and also undertakes to cooperate with the investigation of the case and further undertakes that he will not annoy or disturb the informant or any of his family members in any manner during the pendency of the case.

Learned counsel appearing for the State as well as the learned counsel for the informant on the other vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that keeping in view the direct allegation of serious nature of offence against the petitioner;

custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the case and there is also every chance of petitioner of absconding and tampering with evidence, if given the privilege of anticipatory bail. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature allegation against the petitioner, there is requirement of his custodial interrogation and there is every chance of the petitioner of absconding and tampering with evidence. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail application is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated:- 07.10.2026
Amar/