

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.2755 of 2026

Firoz Ansari @ Md. Firoz, aged about 43 years, son of Razak Mian,
resident of Champa, P.O. Chapwa, P.S. Muffasil, Dist. Hazaribag
.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Alihasan Ansari, S/o Shadat Mian, R/O Village Hendegarha,
P.O. & P.S. Mandu, Dist. Hazaribag
.... Opposite Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sanat Kumar Jha, Addl.P.P.
For the O.P. No.2 : Mr. Lalan Kumar Singh, Advocate
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate

Order No:-03 Dated:-18-06-2026

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with Complaint Case No.1563 of 2011 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 302, 120B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was involved in the murder of the deceased - Idris Ansari. It is next submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is then submitted that on the basis of fardebeyan of the wife of the deceased - Idris Ansari, police registered U.D. Case and in her fardebeyan before the police, the wife of the deceased stated that the deceased committed suicide inside the forest because of her reluctance to accompany the deceased to his house. It is also submitted that the statement of the complainant was recorded during the course of the investigation of the said U.D. Case and in paragraph no.13 of the case diary of the said U.D. Case, it has categorically been mentioned that in their statement, the complainant as well as his father stated before the police that the petitioner and others have murdered the deceased by hanging him. It is further submitted that in the complaint, the only allegation against the petitioner is that the

petitioner is a political person who has command over the local administration and asked the deceased to get separated from the wife of the deceased namely Sajda Khatoon and threatened the deceased of dire consequences unless he separates from his wife – Sajda Khatoon. It is next submitted that there is an inordinate delay in instituting the complaint case. It is then submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 22.01.2026 as mentioned in para-1 of the instant bail application. It is also submitted that the petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para-15 of the instant bail application. It is further submitted that the petitioner undertakes that he will not go to or near the house of the complainant nor will tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner during the trial of the case. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner undertakes to co-operate with the trial of the case and further undertakes not to annoy or disturb the complainant of the case or his family members in any manner during the trial of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the State and the learned counsel for the opposite party No.2 oppose the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

Considering the facts of this case, the above-named petitioner is directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees twenty five thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Hazaribag in connection with Complaint Case No.1563 of 2011 **with the condition that he will co-operate with the trial of the case and furnish his mobile number and photocopy of the Aadhar Card in the court below with an undertaking that he will not change his mobile number during the trial of the case and he will not annoy or disturb the complainant of the case or his family members in any manner during the trial of the case and he will not go to or near the house of the complainant nor will tamper with the evidence of the case in any manner during the trial of the case.**

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)