

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Appeal (DB) No. 948 of 2026

Mukhtar Ansari @ Md. Mukhtar Ansari, S/o Md. Ismael
Ansari, R/o Near Industry Colliery Tikia Para, P.O.- Dhansar,
P.S.- Dhansar, Dist.- Dhanbad.

	---	---	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. Indrajit Sinha, Adv.
For the State : A.P.P.

04/09.09.2026 Heard Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the
appellant and learned A.P.P.

2. This appeal is directed against the order dated
24-06-20226 passed by the learned Additional Sessions
Judge-XI, Dhanbad in A.B.P. No. 1067 of 2026 arising out of
Jharia P.S. Case No. 99/2026, whereby and whereunder,
the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellant has been
rejected.

3. The prosecution case arises out of the self-
statement of Shashi Ranjan Kumar, Officer-In-Charge
Jharia P.S. in which it has been stated that on 09-05-2026
at 12:15AM, an information was received that in the field of
Industry Colliery Raj +2 School, some miscreants have
gathered in order to resort to firing to create terror in Jharia
area. After making a station diary entry, a team was
constituted to conduct a raid and on reaching the place of
occurrence, three persons were found sitting in a suspicious
condition who tried to flee away on seeing the police party.
However, all the three miscreants were apprehended by the

Police and on a search conducted, arms, ammunitions and mobiles were recovered from their possession and seizure lists were prepared. The apprehended accused had confessed that they had gathered to create terror in the area and extort money from the businessmen and common people on the direction of Pankaj Sharma alias Sonu Sharma and Santan Ravidas. The arms and ammunitions were supplied to them by Chandradev Ray. It has been alleged that on the disclosure of the apprehended accused, a raid was conducted in the house of Chandradev Ray in Bastakola and he was found present. Chandradev Ray had disclosed that he supplies arms and ammunitions along with Mukhtar Ansari (appellant) and one Khan Saheb. He had also disclosed that arms have been kept hidden in the house of Mukhtar Ansari and on such information, a raid was conducted by the Police in the house of Mukhtar Ansari at Tikia Para where one person on seeing the Police managed to make good his escape. On a search conducted in the house of Mukhtar Ansari, several arms and ammunitions were recovered and seized.

4. It has been submitted by Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the appellant that the name of the appellant has transpired on the confessional statement of Chandradev Ray. It has been submitted that the house from where the alleged recovery had been effected does not belong to the petitioner but belongs to Chandradev Ray who had purchased the same from the appellant vide agreement dated 24-07-2018. The appellant does not have any criminal antecedent and is employed as a salesman in New Century Sales, Dhanbad.

5. Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail made by the appellant in this appeal and has relied on the Case Diary while submitting that incriminating materials have been collected against the appellant in course of investigation.

6. We have heard the learned counsel for the respective sides and have also perused the case diary.

7. The contents of the First Information Report have been reiterated by the members of the raiding party whose statements have been recorded from para 3 to para 13 of the Case Diary. The confessional statement of the apprehended accused and that of Chandradev Ray finds place from paras 14 to 17 of the Case Diary. The description of the second place of occurrence has been given in para 21 of the Case Diary which is the house of Mukhtar Ansari (appellant) and from where arms and ammunitions were recovered.

8. It is the consistent case of the appellant that the house from where arms and ammunitions were recovered belongs to Chandradev Ray for which reliance has been placed on an agreement dated 24-07-2018. This agreement itself appears to be a dubious piece of document as despite the appellant having no title over the land in question which in fact belongs to BCCL, he had purportedly sold a two-roomed temporary structure to Chandradev Ray. Such defence of the appellant does not hold good in view of the apparent untrustworthy nature of the document relied upon by the learned counsel for the appellant. The appellant having failed to rebut the case of the prosecution with respect to recovery of arms and ammunitions from the house of the appellant, we are not inclined to interfere in the order dated 24-06-2026 passed by the learned Additional

Sessions Judge-XI, Dhanbad in A.B.P. No. 1067 of 2026 arising out of Jharia P.S. Case No. 99/2026 and consequently, this appeal is **dismissed**.

9. Pending I.A.(s), if any, stands closed.

(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

Dated- 09th September, 2026.
Preet/-
Uploaded on: 10/09/2026.