

[2025:JHHC:10869]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A No.2261 of 2025

Vikash Yadav @ Vikash Kumar aged about 23 years son of Magha
Yadav @ Mahanga Mahto Resident of village Karudih, P.O. & police
station-Pratappur, Dist.-Chatra

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Abhay Kr. Chaturvedy, Advocate

For the State : Mrs. Mohua Palit, Addl. P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 09-04-2025

Heard the parties.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Pratappur P.S. Case No.127 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 127(2), 115 (2), 109(1), 132, 121(1), 326(f), 326(g), 309 (5), 61(2) of the B.N.S., 2023 and under Section 3/4 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was members of an unlawful assembly and in prosecution of common object of the assembly, trespassed to the police station after breaking open the lock put on the gate of the police station, vandalized the police station by destroying the government documents, set fire to the table and chair of the police station by bringing inflammable material and setting fire to the table and chair after sprinkling the inflammable material and attempted to murder the police personnel who were in the police station. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false and are general and omnibus in nature. It is then submitted that the petitioner undertakes to cooperate with the investigation of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

The learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the

prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that keeping in view the fact that the petitioner has no respect for law and they vandalized the police station and set fire to the same, deterring the public servant from discharging their duties as well as attempted to murder them, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the case. It is next submitted that the co-accused with similar allegations has already been rejected anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 25.03.2025 passed in ABA no. 1831 of 2025. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner and the requirement of their custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case to find out the details of the case, this Court is not inclined to give the privilege of anticipatory bail to the abovenamed petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail to the above named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)