

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 2295 of 2025

1. Bablu Kumar Singh @Dablu Singh @Bablu Singh, S/o Ajay Singh, R/o Bajadi, P.O. Bahwara, P.S. Silar, District-Aurangabad
2. Munna Kumar @Munna Singh, S/o Ajay Singh, R/o House No. 10, Biswasbari, Jojobera, P.O. Rahargora, P.S. Jojobera, Town Jamshedpur, District- East Singhbhum.

... **Petitioners**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... **Opposite Party**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner :	Mr. Ayush Kumar Verma, Advocate
For the State:	Mr. Saket Kumar, A.P.P.

03/ 08.07.2025

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned A.P.P. appearing for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita has been preferred by the petitioners apprehending their arrest in connection with Telco P.S. Case No. 127 of 2024 registered for offences alleged under Sections 103 and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023 and under Section 27 of the Arms Act, pending in the Court of the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jamshedpur.

3. As per the First Information Report, it has been alleged that on 16.11.2024 one Salman Khan informed the informant that informant's father had been shot and was taken to the hospital. On reaching the hospital, the informant found his father dead. It has been further alleged that Salman Khan said that he had seen two unknown criminals aged 20 to 25 years were on bike armed with pistol and on another bike other accused persons were armed with pistol. The informant's father used to transport chassis from factory of Tata Motors to showroom and had dispute with Sagar Kamath @ Bittu who demanded extortion and had also assaulted the drivers employed by his father. For the earlier offence a case had been lodged and same is pending. It has been alleged that said Sagar Kamath @ Bittu had asked the deceased to withdraw the said case, which he refused. It has also been alleged that one Mukesh Kumar, friend of Kundan Yadav, had also threatened the deceased. The informant has expressed suspicion against those persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present and their name has transpired

from the confessional statement of co-accused. There is no eye witness or any material against the petitioners. The petitioners are the relatives of the informant and have no concern with the entire occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer of the petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the names of the petitioners have transpired during the investigation and co-accused has stated that the petitioners gave *Supari* for killing of the deceased.

6. After hearing the counsel for the parties and going through the records, I find that the allegation against the petitioners is grave in nature. Keeping in view that the investigation in this case is still going on as also in view of the nature of allegation, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioners is hereby rejected.

7. This anticipatory bail application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Ananda Sen, J.)

Kumar/Cp-03