

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Criminal Appeal (S.J) No.744 of 2025

1. Zakir Ansari, aged about 25 years, son of Rustam Ansari.
 2. Imtiyaz Ansari @ Bablu Ansari, aged about 27 years, son of Sajjad Ansari
 3. Salman Ansari, aged about 23 years, son of Islam Miyan
- All are resident of Vill-Heth Balu, Balu, P.O. Kokdoro, P.S. Pithoria,
District Ranchi
- **Appellant(s)**

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand
 2. Butan Devi, aged about 45 years, wife of Dhaneshwar Pahan, resident of Vill-Heth Balu, Balu, P.O. Sadkandu, P.S. Pithoria, District Ranchi.
- **Respondent(s)**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR

For the Appellants	: Mr. A.K. Chaturvedi, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. Fahad Allam, A.P.P.
For the Victim	: Mr. Prashant Kr. Shrivastava, Advocate

05/Dated: 4th August, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the appellants, learned counsel for the State and the learned counsel for the victim.
2. This Criminal Appeal has been filed against the order dated 11.07.2025 passed by the learned Addl. Judicial Commissioner-II cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Ranchi in A.B.P No.1584 of 2025, whereby and whereunder, the prayer of anticipatory bail of the appellants has been rejected in connection with Pithoria P.S. Case No.39 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 190, 299, 300, 126(2), 115(2), 109, 74, 352, 351(2), 351(3) of BNS and Section 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the SC/ST (PoA) Act. Now the case is pending in the Court of learned Addl. Judicial Commissioner-II cum-Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Ranchi.
3. Learned counsel for the appellants has submitted that the appellants are innocent and have not committed any offence. There is general and omnibus allegation against all the accused persons including the appellants and no specific allegation is levelled against the appellants. It is further submitted that the injury sustained by the Informant side is simple in nature and there is also a case and counter case between both the sides. It is

submitted that even one Rajia Khatoon has instituted Complaint Case No.13736 of 2025 against 31 persons of Informant's side and hence they may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the Respondent No.2 has opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail of the appellants and submitted that the injuries sustained by the Informant are grievous in nature due to which the Informant was admitted in casualty ward of the Hospital. Hence, the prayer of anticipatory bail of the appellants may be rejected.

5. Having heard learned counsel for parties and from perusal of the record, it appears that the appellants are named in the F.I.R for assaulting the son of the Informant and some other persons of Informant's side have sustained injuries. It also appears that the accused persons were raising religious slogans and teased the girls and women of the village.

6. In view of the above, this Court is not inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the appellants. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the appellants is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the present Criminal Appeal is, hereby, dismissed.

8. The appellants are directed to surrender before the trial court and pray for regular bail, if desired.

(Rajesh Kumar, J.)

Dated: 4th August, 2026

Madhav/- Uploaded on: 05/08/2026