

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 128 of 2026

1. Vikash Kumar Dubey @ Vikash Dubey, aged about 42 years, son of Ram Kishor Dubey, resident of Dubey Mohalla, Jugsalai, Goshala Road, P.O. & P.S. Jugsalai, District- East Singhbhum
 2. Avdhesh Kumar @ Awdesk Kumar, aged about 42 years, son of Bharat Prasad, resident of East Plant Basti, P.O. & P.S. Golmuri, Town- Jamshedpur, District- East Singhbhum
- ... Petitioners**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners	: Mr. Agnivesh, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Praful Jojo, A.P.P.
For the Informant	: Mr. J.N. Upadhyay, Advocate

03/04.05.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, learned counsel

appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Burmamines P.S. Case No.69 of 2022, registered for the offence under Sections 385, 387, 504, 506 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Jamshedpur.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that the allegation of extortion is not correct.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State and informant jointly opposed the prayer and submit that even allegations of theft are there and, thereafter, the petitioners have demanded extortion money of Rs.10 Lakhs from the informant. They further submit that it has further come in paras 219 and 220 of the case diary that petitioner no.1 is having 2 criminal antecedents and petitioner no.2 is having 3 criminal antecedents respectively.

5. In view of the above and looking into the contents of the FIR, it transpires that there are direct allegations against the petitioners of demanding extortion money of Rs.10 Lakhs. Further, the petitioners are having criminal antecedents and that has come in paras 219 and 220 of the case diary respectively.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and, as such, their prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 4th May, 2026
Ajay/