

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1962 of 2026

- 1.** Zubaida Khatoon @ Jubeda Khatun, aged about 53 years, D/o Ainul Haque, R/o 193, Cross Road No.10A, Jawahar Nagar, Mango, PO and PS – Mango, Jamshedpur, District – Singhbhum East
- 2.** Rashida Khatun, aged about 53 years, W/o Talib Hussain, R/o 127, Shastri Nagar, Block No.2, Kadma, PO and PS – Kadma, Town – Jamshedpur, District – Singhbhum East
- 3.** Nasima Khatoon @ Nasim Khatoon, aged about 51 years, W/o Mohammad Rashid Ansari, resident of Fauladpur, PO and PS – Ratni Bazar, District – Jahanabad, Bihar - 804425

.... Petitioners

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :- Mr. Tejo Mistry, Advocate

For the State :- Mrs. Mohua Palit, Advocate

02/19.06.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Mango P.S. Case No.183 of 2023 for the alleged offences registered under Sections 302/34 of Indian Penal Code pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jamshedpur.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and the allegation of assault is not made out against the petitioners. He

further submits that due to assault made by the petitioners the deceased has not died. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that the petitioners have forcefully entered into the house of the informant and assaulted the husband of the informant and thereafter the husband of the informant has died. She further submits that the independent witnesses in paragraph Nos.12, 13 and 14 have fully supported the prosecution case.

5. In view of above submission and looking into the contents of the FIR it transpires that there is direct and specific allegation against the petitioners of entering into the house of the informant forcefully and assaulted her and her husband as a result of which the informant became unconscious and the husband of the informant has died. In paragraph Nos.12, 13 and 14 of the case diary, the prosecution witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners are hereby rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated 19.06.2026
Sangam/*