

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No. 2220 of 2025**

----

Bijendra Rai @ B. Rai, aged about 33 years, son of Sudama Rai, resident of Lamtibahal, Gwalapada, Brajarajnagar, P.O. and P.S. Brajarajnagar District-Jharsuguda, State-Odisha.

...

...

**Petitioner**

**Versus**

The State of Jharkhand

...

...

**Opposite Party**

----

**CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.**

----

**For the Petitioner :** Mr. Jitendra Nath Upadhyay, Advocate  
**For the State :** Mr. Prabhu Dayal Agarwal, Spl. P.P.

----

**03/08.07.2025** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Spl. P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection with Adityapur P.S. Case No.118 of 2024, registered for offences punishable under Sections 407 /411/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The case is presently pending in the Court of Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Seraikella.
3. A truck bearing Registration No. WB-23C-9805 carrying 30.376 kg of TMT from Pasa Resources Pvt. Ltd. left for Latehar on 12.04.2024. On 13.04.2024, the informant (a worker of Sonali Transport) spoke with the driver, who said the truck was refueling. After that, the driver's phone was found switched off, and the truck owner did not respond. The informant suspected that the goods have been misappropriated.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is completely innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the petitioner is not named in the First Information Report. He also contends that the petitioner is an agent who arranges transport vehicles online. He also contended that the petitioner is neither the driver nor the owner of the vehicle and has been made accused only on the basis of confessional statement of arrested accused. He further submits that there is no case that he sold the TMT bars or made any profit from them.
5. Learned APP appearing for the state opposes the prayer of the petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner was named by co-accused in paragraph 93 of the case diary. He further submits that the petitioner gave Rs.2,00,000 to co-accused, Md. Nayeem Ansari and sent forged documents to another accused.

6. After hearing the parties I have gone through the available records including the case diary. From the Case Diary, I find that the arrested accused in their confessional statement have specifically stated about the involvement of the petitioner. At paragraph 93, accused Ghulam Ansari while admitting his guilt, has stated that this petitioner used to provide forged documents. Accused Md. Nayeem, also in his confessional statement stated in similar manner. From the Case Diary it also appears that notices under Section 35(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita were issued to the petitioner, but the petitioner did not appear before the police.

7. From the Case Diary it transpires that the investigation is still not complete. Keeping in view the nature of allegations and materials transpired in course of investigation, I find that petitioner's presence and custodial interrogation is required. Considering all these facts, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

8. This anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

**(Ananda Sen, J.)**

Kumar/Cp-03