

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J) No.91 of 2026

1. Bobby Karim @ Bobby Karim @ Zeya Karim, aged about 40 years, S/o Irshad Karim
2. Asi Ahmad @ Ali Ahmad, aged about 60 years, S/o Gyasuddin Ansari
3. Ashique Ansari @ Md. Ashique, aged about 39 years, S/o Md. Harun
4. Rahim Ansari @ Rahim Miyan, aged about 69 years, S/o Surmaliya Miyan
5. Mobarak Ansari @ Mobarak Hussain, aged about 57 years, S/o Badruddin Ansari
6. Mubarak Ansari @ Md. Mobarak, aged about 51 years, S/o Shamsuddin Ansari
7. Aslam Ansari, aged about 34 years, S/o Ali Hussain, *All are Resident of Village Kajri, P.O. Tapin, P.S. Charhi, District Hazaribag*

.... Appellant(s)

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Suresh Murmu, S/o Budhan Murmu, Resident of Village Kajri, P.O Tapin, P.S Charhi, District Hazaribag

.... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellants	: Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Adv.
For the State	: Mr. Santosh Kr. Shukla, A.P.P
For the Respondent No.2	: Mr. Rishav Kumar, Amicus Curiae.

04/Dated: 05th May, 2026

1. Heard the parties.
2. The present appeal has been filed under Section 14-A of the Scheduled Castes & Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.
3. The present appeal has been filed against the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge-VI, Hazaribag in A.B.P No.2028 of 2025, arising out of Hazaribag ST/SC P.S. Case No.15 of 2021, for the offence under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 504, 506 of the Indian Penal Coded and Sections 3(1)(s, 3(1)(g) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, whereby the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant has been rejected. The case is pending in the Court of learned Special Judge SC/ST Act, Hazaribag.

4. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the appellants that there is a land dispute between the parties, and as such, prayer for anticipatory bail is maintainable.

5. Learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the respondent No.2 have opposed the prayer stating that the incident is of the year 2021. The cognizance has already been taken and the trial has begun, however, the appellants are avoiding their appearance in the case. Further, the land is in possession of this respondent No.2/victim. The present appellants have tried to dispossess a member of weaker sections of the society rather they have not been allowed to construction the residential house. Thus, the prohibitory mandate of Sections 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act get attracted and as such, prayer for anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and from perusal of the records, it appears that the appellants are not participating in the trial and considering that the mandate of Section 18 of the SC/ST (PoA) Act get attracted. As such, I am not inclined to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the appellants. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby, rejected.

7. In the result, the present criminal appeal stands rejected.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Dated: 05th May, 2026

Raja/- Uploaded on 07.05.2026