

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 3499 of 2026

Ashwini Ajay Singh, aged about 45 years, son of Ajay Kumar Singh, resident of village-Saroja, P.O. and P.S. Balwahat, District-Saharsa, Bihar, presently residing at Flat No. 204, Laxmi Heights, Plot No. 78, Sector-18, Near Sanjivini International School, Kharghar, P.O. and P.S. Kharghar, Navi Mumbai, Maharashtra

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :Mr. Pankaj Srivastava, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, A.P.P.

02/ 05.08.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Gumla P.S. Case No. 20 of 2026, registered under sections 316(2), 318(4), 3(5) of BNS, pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gumla.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He next submits that petitioner is not involved in cheating the informant and others on the pretext of providing job and even the amount has not been transferred in the account of the petitioner. On these grounds, he submits that the petitioner may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that entire family members of the petitioner including the petitioner are involved in taking the money of the informant and others on the pretext of providing job and in this regard Rs. 36 lakh has been cheated by the family members of the petitioner. He submits that in para 40 of the case diary it has come that even the amount was tried to be transferred in the account of

the petitioner but due to technical fault the same was not transferred. On these grounds, he submits that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

5. It transpires from the content of F.I.R that on the pretext of providing job innocent persons have been cheated and Rs. 36 lakh has been obtained by the family members of the petitioner. In para 40 of the case diary it has come that even the amount was tried to be transferred in the account of the petitioner but due to technical fault the same was not transferred. The entire family members of the petitioner including the petitioner are involved in taking the money of the informant and others on the pretext of providing job.

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

Dt.05.08.2026

satyarthi-

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)