[2026:JHHC:30200]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.5633 of 2026

---

1. Amin Mahto, aged about 63 years, S/o Bhola Mahto, resident of Village- Bandhdih, P.O. + P.S.- Jaridih, District- Bokaro, Jharkhand

2. Ghaltu Prasad Nayak, aged about 80 years, S/o Dukhan Nayak, resident of Village- School Balidih, P.O. + P.S.- Balidih, District- Bokaro, Jharkhand

3. Panchu Sharma, aged about 67 years, S/o Sukhdev Sharma, resident of Village- Tand Mohanpur, P.O. + P.S.- Jaridih, District- Bokaro, Jharkhand;

4. Ketki Vala @ Ketki Bala, aged about 58 years, D/o Ghaltu Prasad Nayak, resident of Village- Korkota, P.O. + P.S.- Hariharpur, District- Dhanbad, Jharkhand

.... …. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Pankaj Verma, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Amrita Kumari, Addl.P.P.

Order No.02 Dated-08-10-2026

Heard the parties.

Apprehending their arrest in connection with Jaridih P.S. Case No.105 of 2026 (arising out of Complaint Case No.1088 of 2025) instituted under Section 318(4), 316(2), 338, 336(3), 61(2) and 3(5) of the B.N.S., 2023, the petitioners have moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioner No.1 has sold the land, the ownership of which is claimed by the informant, to the petitioner No.4. It is submitted that the allegation against the

petitioners is false. Drawing attention of this Court towards para-17 of the instant bail application, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have no criminal antecedent. It is further submitted that there is no allegation against the petitioners of indulging in any impersonation and they have sold the said land to the petitioner No.4 claiming to be the owner of the land. It is further submitted that the informant being a third party to the transaction between the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 on one hand and the petitioner No.4 on the other hand, is not entitled to institute any criminal case against the petitioners. It is further submitted that the petitioner No.4 has no grievance against the petitioner Nos.1 to 3. It is lastly submitted that the petitioners undertake to co-operate with the investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

Considering the settled principle of law as has been held by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of **Mohammed Ibrahim & Others vs. State of Bihar & Another** reported in **(2009) 8 SCC 751** since the informant is a third party to the transaction of sale of the property by the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 as sellers and the petitioner No.4 as purchasers, I am inclined to grant privileges of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the petitioners are directed to surrender in the Court below within two weeks from today and in the event of their arrest or surrendering, they will be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Twenty five thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bermo at Tenughat in connection with Jaridih P.S. Case No.105 of 2026 (arising out of Complaint Case No.1088 of 2025) **with the condition that they will co-operate with the investigation of the case and appear before the investigating officer as and when noticed by him and furnish their mobile number and photocopy of the**

Aadhar Card with an undertaking that they will not change their mobile number during the pendency of case and further conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Dated-08.10.2026-Animesh/