

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 3687 of 2026

Badal Kumar, aged about 26 years, son of Temu Ravidas, resident of village-
Saino, P.O. and P.S. Saino, District-Bhagalpur (Bihar)

..... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner

:Ms. Kabisha Goyenka, Advocate

Mr. Ashish Kr. Thakur, Advocate

For the State

: Mr. Rajesh Kumar, A.P.P.

02/ 06.08.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Godda (Town) P.S. Case No. 242 of 2024, registered under sections 316(2)
and 318(4) of BNS, 2023 and under section 66 (C) and 66(D) of Information
Technology Act, 2000, pending in the Court of learned Chief Judicial
Magistrate, Godda.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has
been falsely implicated in this case and he has nothing to do with the
alleged allegation of cyber crime. She next submits that no money has been
transferred in the account of the petitioner. She further submits that
petitioner is PUS distributor of SIM Card. On these grounds, she submits that
the petitioner may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits
that serious allegation of misappropriating SIM Card and cyber crime of Rs.
29,87, 538/- is there. He next submits that in para 208 of the case diary it
has come that petitioner has criminal antecedent and in view of that
anticipatory bail of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

5. In the F.I.R there is allegation of cyber crime of Rs. 29,87,538/-.

In para 208 of the case diary it has come that petitioner is having criminal antecedent being Godda (Town) P.S. Case No. 286 of 2024 under the Information Technology Act. All the witnesses in paras 6 and 7 of the case have supported the case of prosecution.

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.06.08.2026

satyarthi-

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)