

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1416 of 2026

Sonu Kumar, aged about 29 years, son of Sanjay Prasad,
resident of Gondapur, Nawada, P.O. & P.S.- Nawada, District-
Nawada, Bihar **.... Petitioner**

-- Versus --

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Rishav Kumar, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, Advocate

02/08.04.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well
as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Kanke P.S. Case No.221 of 2025 for the alleged offences registered
under Sections 305/331(3) of the B.N.S., pending in the Court of
learned Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has earlier moved before this court in A.B.A. No.7352
of 2025, which was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the
petitioner to move before the learned Court on the basis of the
judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of
Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation &
another, reported in ***(2022) 10 SCC 51***. He submits, however,
thereafter the petitioner filed the A.B.P. No.483 of 2026 and the
same was dismissed by the learned Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi
saying there is no fresh ground. Second anticipatory bail has been

filed on these grounds, he submits that the anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that learned Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi has rightly dismissed the A.B.P. as the petitioner has not complied with the liberty provided to the petitioner by this court passed in A.B.A. No.7352 of 2025.

5. If the petitioner has withdrawn the petition with liberty to move before the learned court on the basis of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Satender Kumar Antil v. Central Bureau of Investigation & another***, reported in ***(2022) 10 SCC 51***, the petitioner was required to appear before the court by way of appearance and thereafter pray for bail. However, the petitioner has chosen not to appear before the court and filed the second anticipatory bail, in that view of matter, the learned Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi has rightly passed the said order. There is no illegality. Further in course of the argument, no fresh ground has been stated to maintain the second anticipatory bail.

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 dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 08.04.2026
Jay/