(2026:JHHC:30225)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 5649 of 2026

------

1. Md. Shahabul, aged about 44 years, s/o Ismail Mian
2. Md. Alam @ Alam Ansari, aged about 45 years, s/o late Rojan Mian
3. Md. Barik @ Abdul Barik Ansari, aged about 43 years, s/o Maniruddin
4. Md. Sohail, aged about 22 years, s/o Md. Imtiyaz
5. Md. Ayan @ Md. Imran, aged about 28 years, s/o Md. Sadik
6. Md. Modassir, aged about 37 years, s/o Md. Yunus
7. Md. Manjur, aged about 46 years, s/o Gani Miyan
8. Mukhtar @ Mukhtar Ahmad, aged about 50 years, s/o Mani Mian @ Maniruddin
9. Md. Numan, aged about 22 years, s/o Md. Kurban
10. Md. Rauf, aged about 36 years, s/o Abdul Gani @ Gani Miyan
11. Ashiya Khatoon @ Ashiya Khatun, aged about 35 years, daughter of Mumtaz Hussain
12. Chhotu @ Abdul Kadir Jilani, aged about 30 years, son of Mumtaz Hussain

    All are r/o Village-Salga, Sultana, P.O.-Sultana, P.S.-Katkamdag, Dist.-Hazaribagh

… Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ⋯ Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Awnish Shankar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Manoj Kr. Mishra, Addl. P.P.

Order No.02 Dated- 08.10.2026

Heard the parties.

Apprehending their arrest, the petitioners have moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Katkamdag P.S. Case No.40 of 2026 registered for the offences punishable under sections 191(1)/ 191(2)/ 191(3)/ 192/ 132/ 196(2)/299/293/126(2)/115(2)/118(1)/109(1)/324(2)/125(a)/125(b) of the B.N.S., 2023.

The Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners were

member of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of the common object of the assembly attempted to murder the member of *Ram Navmi* procession by pelting huge number of stones and also assaulting the persons who are going in the procession with sharp cutting weapons and *lathi, danda* causing injury to several persons and when police party reached the place of occurrence, the petitioners attempted to murder the public servant-police personnel also and they were uttering words to outrage the religious feelings and sentiments of the members of the other community and to create hatred against them. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are all false and some of the petitioners are females. It is then submitted that the petitioners undertake to cooperate with the investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that keeping in view the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners, there is requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioners during the investigation of the case for recovery of weapon of offence and other details of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners and the requirement of custodial interrogation of the petitioners during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the abovenamed petitioners be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail of the abovenamed petitioners is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

08.10.2026
Gunjan-