

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1850 of 2026

Mohammad Kalam Ansari, aged about 58 years, son of Jumali Ansari, resident of village – Madanpur, Kokdoro, near – Masjid Tola, PO and PS – Pithoria, District – Ranchi

.... Petitioner

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Ms. Micky Kumari, Advocate

For the State :- Mrs. Mahua Palit, Advocate

02/28.04.2026 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 Pithoria P.S. Case No.160 of 2025 for the alleged offences registered under Sections 316 and 318 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M., Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and the dispute is with regard to not executing the sale deed. She further submits that if any case is there that is civil in nature. On these grounds, she submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that there is direct allegation of cheating and the petitioner has taken the money and not executed the sale deed and

even engaged in impersonation to take further money in the name of dead person. She further submits that intention to cheat from the very beginning is there. On these grounds, she submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Initially the petitioner entered into an agreement with the father of informant and has taken the amount and father of the informant was insisting to execute the sale deed, however, they have not done so and thereafter the father died and informant discovered the matter and it is alleged that the petitioner took Rs.70,000/- from the informant on the ground of making the road by way of paying certain amount to a person and that person was already died and in view of that intention to cheat from the very beginning is there.

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

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated 28.04.2026
Sangam/*