

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cr. Appeal (D.B.) No. 491 of 2026

Imtiyaz Ansari

....

.... **Appellant**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

....

.... **Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR RAI

For the Appellant: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Karan, Advocate

For the Resp.-State: A.P.P.

I.A. No. 9153 of 2026

04/ 07.08.2026 Heard Mr. Rajiv Kumar Karan, learned Counsel for the appellant and learned A.P.P.

2. This application has been preferred by the appellant for grant of bail to him during the pendency of this appeal.

3. The appellant has been convicted for the offences under Section 395 of IPC and Section 27/35 of the Arms Act and has been sentenced to R.I. for 10 years along with a fine of Rs. 1,00,000/- for the offence under Section 395 IPC.

4. It has been alleged that while the informant, his driver and staff were returning from Jamtara after realizing his dues amounting to Rs. 11,00,000/-, on the way, one Scorpio vehicle and two motorcycles overtook the vehicle of the informant and firing was also made.

5. It has been alleged that the accused persons had surrounded the car and thereafter, looted Rs. 11,00,000/- on the point of pistol and had also looted away the mobiles of the occupants of the car.

6. Submission has been advanced by the learned Counsel for the appellant that the Investigating Officer has adopted a pick and choose policy as though the appellant was put on the Test Identification Parade, but out of the six accused persons, four were not put on the Test Identification Parade based upon which, they have been granted bail by this Court.

7. Learned Counsel submits that the appellant is in custody since long and save and except the identification of the appellant, in the Test Identification Parade, there is nothing on record to suggest the involvement of the appellant in committing dacoity in the house of the informant.

8. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the appellant.

9. It seems that the informant who has been examined as P.W.-10 had identified the appellant in the Test Identification

Parade as one of the dacoits who was involved in the offence.

10. Though some of the co-convicts have been granted bail by us, but regard being had to the fact that the case of the present appellant is easily distinguishable from the case of those co-convicts on account of the non-holding of the T.I.P., whereas the appellant was identified in the T.I.P., we are not inclined to admit the appellant on bail. Accordingly, his prayer for bail is hereby rejected at this stage.

11. I.A. No. 9153 of 2026 stands rejected.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

7th August, 2026
Suman/Rajnish
Uploaded