

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 127 of 2026

Ram Janam Rawani, aged about 51 years, S/o late Ganesh Rawani,
R/o village – Etwal No.6, P.O. – Kusunda & P.S. – Kenduadih,
District - Dhanbad **Appellant**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Prakash Kumar Rajak @ Jaiprakash Rajak, son of late Harkit Rajak, resident of village – Etwal No.6, P.O. Kusunda, P.S. Kenduadih, District – Dhanbad (Jharkhand)

... .. **Respondent**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Appellant : Mr. Tejasma Mohanta, Advocate
For the Respondent : Ms. Kumari Rashmi, Advocate

04/19.06.2026 This petition has been filed against the order dated 10.11.2025 passed in A.B.P No.2844 of 2025, by learned Additional Sessions Judge – I – cum – Special Judge, SC / ST Act, Dhanbad, for the offences registered under Sections 324, 354, 504, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Sections 4, 5, 6 of S.C./S. T (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and cognizance was taken for the offence under Section 323, 504 of Indian Penal Code and Section 3 (i) (x) of SC / ST (POA) Act, 1989 passed by learned C.J.M., Dhanbad in S.C. / S.T. Case No.212 of 2018, arising out of C.P. Case No.2287 of 2017, now pending in the court of A.D.J. Ist Dhanbad – cum – Special Judge SC / ST Act.

2. The learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that earlier the appellant had challenged the order dated 22.04.2019 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge – VII in MCA (Miscellaneous Criminal Application) No.660 of 2019 in connection with SC/ST case No.212 of 2018 registered under Sections 4, 5, and 6 of Schedule Caste and Schedule Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 and Sections 324, 354, 504/34 of IPC whereby the anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order dated 09.12.2019 and the petitioner was directed to surrender.

3. He submits that now through this appeal, the order dated 10.11.2025 passed in A.B.P. No.2844 of 2025, has been challenged whereby the anticipatory bail application of the appellant has been rejected again.

4. The learned counsel for the appellant has not been able to point out any subsequent development for filing fresh application seeking anticipatory bail and considering the fact that the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant was rejected earlier and upon going through the impugned order dated 10.11.2025, the learned court having taken this aspect of the matter into consideration, this Court finds no illegality in the impugned order dated 10.11.2025 refusing to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, this appeal is hereby dismissed.

6. Let a soft copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/email.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of order: 19.06.2026

Saurav/-

Date of uploading: 20.06.2026