

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 2196 of 2026

XXXX

.... **Petitioner**

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand

.... **Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate

For the State :- Mrs. Mohua Palit, Advocate

For the Informant :- Mr. Deepak Sahu, Advocate

02/07.05.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the Informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Rajmahal P.S. Case No.418 of 2025 for the alleged offences registered under Sections 85, 126(2), 109(1), 117(2), 76, 89 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M., Rajmahal.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that false allegation is made against the petitioner and the petitioner happened to be husband of the informant. He further submits that even there is no injury in spite of that Section 109(1) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 has been included. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State and Informant jointly opposed the prayer and submits that in the FIR allegations of

torture, demand of dowry and even assault are there and in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Considering that the petitioner happened to be husband and in the FIR allegation is there against the petitioner of demand of dowry of Rs.4 lacs and torturing and on later part of the FIR it has been further alleged that when the informant talked with the petitioner for justice he has threatened the informant that he will not do anything and even no amount will be provided to her and it is further stated that on 03.11.2025 this petitioner has gone to the house of the parents of the informant and demanded Rs.4 lacs and indulged in altercation and even started assaulting the wife and when the informant's father interfered the father was also assaulted by the petitioner.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated 07.05.2026
Sangam/*