

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No. 1758 of 2026**

Shardanand Dev, Aged 65 years, S/o Late Banarshi Lal Dev, R/o A-126, Hari Nagar, Clock Tower, Mayapuri, South West Delhi, PO Sector-2, Dwarika, PS Sector-9, Dwarika, New Delhi.

... .. **Petitioner**

Versus

ACB through the State of Jharkhand. ... **Opp. Party**

---

**CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY**

---

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vikash Kumar, Advocate  
For the ACB : Mrs. Nehala Sharmin, SPP

---

**03/16.04.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with A.C.B. P.S. Case No.21/ 2017, for the alleged offence registered under Section 13(2) read with 13(1)(e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and the case is presently pending in the court of learned ADJ II cum Special Judge (ACB), Hazaribag.

3. The prosecution is based on a written report of informant-Indubhushan Ojha, Inspector of Police, Anti-Corruption Police Station, Hazaribag stating that one Kushma Devi lodged complaints to the Superintendent of Police, A.C.B. Hazaribag alleging that her land has been acquired for construction of Koderma-Ranchi Rail Track, for which award was granted by Government and while payment of awarded money by cheque, the Land Acquisition Officer (petitioner), instructed the her to contact Nazir, Navlesh Kumar, who demanded 10% of awarded amount as bribe. It is further alleged that the co-accused, while providing account opening form, withdrawal forms etc told her that one Bank account is required to be opened at Bank of India, Koderma, Branch and obtained their signatures on blank forms including withdrawal forms and, in such manner, co-accused withdrew the money in connivance with bank staffs from Kushma Devi, Bank accounts from 10 to 25%.

Finding the allegation to be true, Ranchi instituted case under sections 406, 420, 120B, of the Indian Penal Code and under section 13(1) (d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, against petitioner. During investigation it was found that petitioner, the then District Land

Acquisition Officer, Koderma was posted from 01.03.2014 to 31.01.2016 and has acquired assets and properties disproportionate to his known source of income. During the financial year 2014-15, the petitioner had deposited Rs. 54,02,287.00 in the Axis Bank, Koderma Branch accounts in the name of his wife Smt. Sudha Dev, so called wife Smt Sumitra Devi, Shri Mahendra Kumar (LIC Agent) and also for himself. It is further alleged that during the financial year, 2014-15, the petitioner has purchased 15 decimals land in the name of his family members valued Rs. 20,76,600.00. It is further alleged that the petitioner has acquired another land in the name of his daughter Smt. Smita Deo valued Rs. 1,30,000.00. The petitioner has also invested in LIC as premium amount for himself Rs, 45,526.00 half yearly, Rs, 13,632/- in the name of his wife Smt. Sudha Dev and Rs, 25,658.00 and Rs. 25,658.00 for other family members. It is further alleged that the petitioner was having three storied building at Chas, Bokaro, cost of about Rs, 75,000,00/- (excluding the landed property) and total known income was found Rs. 1,64,78,887/-. Total income from the salary of the petitioner from 01.03.2014 to 31.03.2016 was Rs. 16,47,166/- but total expenditure is Rs. 90.27,290/- which showed that petitioner has acquired the various assets and properties disproportionate to his known source of income during his tenure from 01.03.2014 to 31.01.2016 which is check period.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected vide order/ judgment dated 14.08.2018 in A.B.A. No.5201 of 2017 and thereafter processes under Sections 82 and 83 Cr. P.C. were issued, but the same were quashed by this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 13.08.2025 in Cr. M. P. No.9117 of 2025 and thereafter the petitioner has renewed his prayer for anticipatory bail.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the sole ground for renewal of anticipatory bail is that the petitioner is not in an appropriate physical condition to surrender before the learned Trial Court as he is partially paralyzed.

6. Learned counsel for the opposite party-ACB has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there are direct and serious allegations against the petitioner. He submits that by a detailed order was passed while rejecting the earlier bail application of the petitioner. He further submits that during the pendency of the earlier bail application, order was passed

asking the petitioner to appear before the ACB giving him interim protection, but in spite of that the petitioner did not care to comply with the direction and ultimately the prayer for anticipatory bail was rejected. The following has been recorded in the earlier order of rejection of Anticipatory Bail dated 14.08.2018 in A.B.A. No.5201 of 2017:-

*Vide order dated 13.06.2018, learned counsel for the petitioner was directed to supply the cell number of the petitioner to the learned Spl. P.P. and learned Spl. P.P. was directed to supply the cell number of the petitioner to the I.O. and I.O. was directed to record the statement of the petitioner by giving 72 hours' notice to the petitioner fixing date, time and place. Thereafter this case was listed for today 08.08.2018.*

*On 08.08.2018, learned Spl. P.P. for the A.C.B. has stated that despite issuance of notice, petitioner has not appeared before the I.O., therefore, his statement has not been recorded by the I.O.*

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties this court finds that the petitioner has been throughout not cooperating with the investigation which has ultimately led to rejection of his anticipatory bail application and the health reasons of partial paralysis as cited by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not an acceptable ground to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner when there are direct allegations against the petitioner and seen in the light of the aforesaid conduct of the petitioner. Accordingly, the renewed prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

8. Petitioner is directed to surrender before the learned Trial Court by 30.04.2026.

9. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

**(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)**

Dated: 16.04.2026

Uploaded on:

sandeep/-