

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1829 of 2026

1. Sarjun Yadav @ Mithlesh Yadav @ Mithilesh Kumar

Yadav aged about 21 years son of Ramotar Yadav

2. Ramesh Yadav @ Ramesh Kumar Yadav @ Ramesh

Kumar, aged about 29 years, son of Ramotar Yadav

3. Akhilesh Yadav @ Akhilesh Kumar Yadav aged

about 25 years, son of Ramotar Yadav

4. Anil Yadav @ Anil Kumar Yadav @ Anil Kumar,

aged about 23 years, Son of Ramotar Yadav

Resident of village-Paharpura, P.O. Salaiya,
Police Station Bashisthnagar Jori, District Chatra.

..... ... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Mr. A.K. Chaturvedi, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Azeemuddin, A.P.P.

For the Informant : Mr. Ritesh Kumar, Advocate.

04/ 16.06.2026 At the outset, learned counsel appearing for the petitioners

submits that petitioner Nos. 2 to 4 have already been apprehended and
in view of that he is not pressing this petition on their behalf.

2. In view of his such submission, this petition is dismissed as
not pressed so far as petitioner Nos. 2 to 4, named above, are
concerned. This petition only survives for petitioner No. 1.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner No. 1, learned
A.P.P for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

4. The petitioner No. 1 is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Bashisthanagar P.S. Case No. 100 of 2025, registered
for the offence under Sections 115 (2), 126(2), 109, 64, 303 (2),
352,351 (2), 351(3) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023,
pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chatra.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner No. 1 submits that initially the complaint case was filed, which was later on converted into the FIR by the order of the learned court. He submits that false allegations are made against all the accused persons including the lady members and even it has been alleged that the rape has been committed in presence of all the family members. He next submits that by the earlier order, the case diary was called and the same has been received, where in para-85 which is the supervision report, it has come that the case has not been found true under Section 64 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and it has been found to be the case under Section 75 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and further the lady members have been exonerated by way of disclosing therein that once cogent evidence will be there, thereafter anything will be done against them. He then submits that the land dispute is going on between the parties. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be provided to the petitioner No. 1.

6. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant have opposed the prayer and submit that at least it is proved that the petitioners have forcibly entered into the house of the informant and the case of molestation was also found to be true by the supervising officer. Learned A.P.P. further adds that petitioner No. 1 is having two criminal antecedents and that has come in para-15 of the case diary. On these grounds, they submit that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

7. There is no doubt that initially the complaint case was lodged, which was subsequently converted into the FIR by the order of the learned court and thereafter the investigation proceeded and at least

the case of entering into the house of the informant and outraging the modesty are made out and further in para-15 of the case diary, it has come that the petitioner No. 1 is having two criminal antecedents.

8. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner No. 1 named above. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated:-16.06.2026
Amitesh/-