

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No. 1346 of 2026**

----

Warish Khan @ Pathan @ Waris, aged about 20 years, son of  
Parwej Khan, R/o Ratu Jamun Toli, PO and PS – Ratu, District –  
Ranchi, Jharkhand **.... Petitioner**

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand **.... Opposite Party**

----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI**

---

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Suraj Kishore Prasad, Advocate  
For the State :- Mrs. Anuradha Sahay, Advocate  
For the Informant :- Mr. Sunil Kumar Upadhayay, Advocate

----

**02/07.04.2026** 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  
Sukhdeonagar (Pandra O.P.) P.S. Case No.23 of 2026 for the alleged  
offences registered under Sections 318(4), 109(1), 118(2), 351(2),  
352, 3(5) and 61(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section  
27 of Arms Act pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate  
First Class, XXVI, Ranchi.

**3.** Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that  
the petitioner has nothing to do with the said firing and demanding  
of Rs.58 lacs from the informant related to one land dealing. He  
further submits that the allegation of demand is there against  
Sanjay Pandey. On these backgrounds, 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 all have reached to the spot and have threatened dire consequences and even the demand of Rs.58 lacs has been made.

**5.** In the FIR it has come that all the accused persons have reached to the spot and the accused Sanjay Pandey extended threat of dire consequences with regard to realization of Rs.58 lacs by the informant related to one land dealing. The petitioner is named in the FIR and there are direct and specific allegations against the accused persons that they being members of unlawful assembly and in furtherance with common objectives committed offences.

**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. However, if any, regular bail application is being filed by the petitioner that will be decided in accordance with law without prejudice to this order.

**(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

*Dated 07.04.2026  
Sangam/*