

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1808 of 2026

1. Md. Sajid Ansari, aged about 43 years.
2. Hafiz Ansari, aged about 41 years.
3. Ishtyak Ansari, aged about 33 years.
4. Majid Ansari, aged about 38 years.
5. Saddam Ansari, aged about 36 years.

All sons of Alam Ansari, Resident of Village Hochar, Pokhar Toli, Near Talab P.O Husir, P.S Kanke, District Ranchi, Jharkhand

6. Azad Ansari, aged about 52 years, son of Enul Hak, Resident of Village-Hochar, Pokhar Toli, Near Talab, P.O. Husir, P.S. Kanke, District Ranchi Jharkhand.
7. Abdul Kalam@Kalam Ansari, aged about 19 years, son of Abdul Aziz Resident of Village-Hochar, Pokhar Toli, Near Talab, P.O. Husir, P.S. Kanke, District Ranchi Jharkhand.

.... Petitioners

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Mr. Wazid Ali, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Suraj Deo Munda, A.P.P.

03/21.04.2026 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. 23 of 2026, for the alleged offences registered under Section 115 (2), 126(2), 117(2), 303(2), 308(3), 351(2), 352, and 3(5) of B.N.S 2023, pending in the Court of learned Judicial

Magistrate 1st Class, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submit that false allegations have been made against the petitioners for threatening and forcing to execute the sale deed and demanding money. He further submits that the entire family members have been made accused in this case, and hence the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners may kindly be allowed.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and submits that serious allegations are there against the petitioners of forcing the informant on the gun-point to execute the sale deed and demanding of money, and in view of that the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner may be rejected.

5. Looking into the contents of the F.I.R, it transpires that allegations against the petitioners are there of threatening the villagers, and they are said to be the land grabbers. The petitioners have demanded 10 decimals of land or Rs. 10 lakh as extortion money, and also threatened the informant of the dire consequences, in the attending facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence the anticipatory bail application of the petitioners stand rejected.

21.04.26

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Abha/