

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3710 of 2026

Sagar Lakhua, S/o Lakhi Lakhua, aged about 34 years, resident of Village-Purnapani, P.O. Purnapani, P.S. Hathibari, Dist. Sundargarh (Orissa), Pin-770035
... **Petitioner**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... **Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Santosh Kumar Shukla, A.P.P.
For the Informant	: Md. Sharukh Ansari, Advocate
	Md. Asadul Haque, Advocate

05/12.08.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Doranda P.S. Case No.53/2026, registered for the offence under Sections 64(M), 69, 88, 89, 79 and 351(3) of the BNS, pending in the Court of the learned C.J.M., Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that the petitioner and informant, both are major and what has happened, that was consensual in nature. He next submits that false allegations are made of establishing relationship on the pretext of marriage. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State and informant jointly opposed the prayer and submit that even the petitioner has threatened the informant to kidnap her and to eliminate her family. They further submit that serious allegations are there against the petitioner and in view of that, the prayer for anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. On perusal of the FIR, it transpires that the petitioner and informant, both are major. Further in para 67 of the case diary, WhatsApp chat has been recorded and that is also part of the case diary, wherefrom, it transpires that the petitioner has threatened the informant to eliminate her entire family. The petitioner has also threatened the informant that once he will come out from the custody, he will do so. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and, as such, his prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 12th August, 2026
Ajay/