

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 4207 of 2026

Om Prakash Mahto, aged about 34 years, son of Mahendra Mahto, resident
of village Purni Ray (Railway Station), P.O. and P.S. Khelari, District-Ranchi
..... ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

With

A.B.A. No.4638 of 2026

Vijay Kumar Singh @ Vijay Singh, aged about 51 years, son of Dhup Narayan
Singh, resident of 1-BR Colony Bachra, P.O.. Bachra, P.S. Piprawar, District-
Chatra

..... ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners	:Mr. Ranjan Kumar Singh, Advocate
	: Mr. Munga Lal Kumar Chitra, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Prabhu Dayal Agrawal, Spl.P.P.
	(in A.B.A. No. 4207/2026)
	: Mr. Praful Jojo, A.P.P.
	(in A.B.A. No. 4638 of 2026)

02/ 16.09.2026: Both the anticipatory bail applications are arising out of
same F.I.R, hence both the petitions are being heard together with the consent
of the parties.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel
for the State in respective cases.

3. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection
with Khelari P.S. Case No. 4 of 2026, registered under sections 115(2),
118(2), 74, 352 and 3(5) of BNS, 2023, pending in the Court of learned
Judicial Magistrate XXXII, Ranchi.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that present case
is counter case of earlier case filed by the petitioners side. He next submits
that all the family members have been made accused and another two of the

co-accused persons have been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Judge however anticipatory bail of these petitioners have been rejected. He next submits that false allegation is made and there is delay in lodging the F.I.R. On these grounds, he submits that the petitioner may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned counsels for the State in respective cases oppose the prayer and submit that so far case of other two co-accused persons who have been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Judge are concerned, there were general and omnibus allegations against them and in view of that the learned Sessions Judge has granted anticipatory bail to them and so far these two petitioners are concerned there are direct allegation against these petitioners of assault and outraging the modesty of informant and her daughter. On these grounds, they submit that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

6. On perusal of F.I.R it transpires that there are direct allegation against these two petitioners of outraging the modesty of informant and her daughter and so far other two co-accused persons who have been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Sessions Judge are concerned, there were general and omnibus allegations against them and in view of that the learned Sessions Judge has rightly granted anticipatory bail to them and rejected the anticipatory bail of these petitioners.

7. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer of anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.