

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 2187 of 2026

Anil Swarnkar @ Anil Kumar Swarnkar, aged about 58 years, son of late Jagar Nath Soni, resident of Shiv Shakti Nagar Chas, P.O. and P.S. Chas, District-Bokaro

..... ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner

:Mrs. Chaitali C. Sinha, Advocate

For the State

: Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, A.P.P.

02/ 01.05.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with B.S. City P.S. Case No. 398 of 2014, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 1635 of 2014, registered under sections 385, 386, 34 of I.P.C and under section 27 of the Arms Act and cognizance has been taken for the offence under sections 385, 386, 34 of I.P.C and under section 27 of the Arms, pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bokaro.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the petitioner has moved in A.B.A. No. 520 of 2016 which was rejected by order dated 08.08.2016. She submits that on the fresh ground second anticipatory bail application has been filed. According to her order taking cognizance was challenged by the petitioner in Cr.M.P. No. 1726 of 2017 and by order dated 10.06.2016 order taking cognizance was quashed and the matter was remanded back to pass afresh order on the point of cognizance. She further submits that thereafter again cognizance has been taken against the petitioner and in view of that the present anticipatory bail application has been filed. She next submits that the case is of civil nature inspite of that criminal proceeding has been initiated against the petitioner. On these

grounds, she submits that petitioner may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that allegation of grabbing the land of the informant is there by the petitioner and some portion of land has already been grabbed. He further submits that when the informant was in his house two persons came there on a motorcycle and opened fire on his house and in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Looking into contents of F.I.R, it transpires that allegation of grabbing the land of the informant by the petitioner is there and even some portion of land has already been grabbed. Two persons came in the house of the informant on a motorcycle and opened fire on his house. Learned Sessions Judge has recorded in the impugned order that in para 21 of the case diary the informant has fully supported his case. Further it has been recorded that the witnesses in paragraph nos. 23, 24, 25 and 26 of the case diary have supported the allegation against the petitioner. Earlier the anticipatory bail of the petitioner has already been rejected.

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

Dt.01.05.2026

satyarthi-

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)