

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.2043 of 2025

Shankar Ganjhu, son of Bhola Ganjhu, resident of village Benti,
PO Bahera, PS Piparwar, District Chatra **Petitioner(s)**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand. **Opposite Party(s)**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Niranjana Kumar, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Azeemuddin, A.P.P.

03/ 07.07.2025

Heard the parties.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest for offences registered under Sections 326(f), 308(2), 308(3), 308(4), 308(5), 285, 324(5), 111(2)(b), 111(4) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 17 of the CLA Act pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Latehar in connection with Balumath PS Case No. 111 of 2024.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and only on the basis of confessional statement of this petitioner in Balumath PS Case No. 121 of 2024, he has been made an accused.

4. The instant case has been registered against the unknown miscreants. It is alleged that the informant's company is engaged in transportation of coal in CCL Magadh Sangammitra Area. It is alleged that on 01.10.2024 at about midnight the vehicle which was engaged in transportation and unloading of coal was completely torched by anti-social elements. A Can of petrol was also recovered from the place of occurrence which appears to have been used for torching the vehicle.

5. Though the petitioner is not named in the FIR, during investigation it has come to the notice that the petitioner is the member of the extremist group and Balumath PS Case No. 121

of 2024 was also instituted against him. In the aforesaid case when the petitioner was arrested, he confessed his guilt that he was also involved in the offence which is the subject matter of this FIR.

6. Learned A.P.P. representing the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail.

7. Further in the impugned order, I find that it has been mentioned that there are two other cases pending against this petitioner.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts, the nature of offence and criminal antecedents of the petitioner in different districts, this Court finds it not a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as in this case custodial interrogation may be needed.

9. Accordingly, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **dismissed.**

(ANANDA SEN, J.)