

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1373 of 2026

Sarfraj Khan @ Sarfaraz @ Sallu Khan, aged about 26 years,
son of Iqbal Khan, R/o Ratu Chatti, 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	:-	Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, Advocate
For the Informant	:-	Mr. Sunil Kumar Upadhayay, Advocate

02/06.04.2026 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 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 06.04.2026
Sangam/*