

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 5387 of 2025

1. Md. Ashif Samar @ Aasif Samar @ Aassif Samar,
aged about 31 years,

2. Sakib Samar, aged about 29 years,

Both sons of Md. Samruddin @ Md. Samsuddin

Both R/o Castair Town, P.O., P.S. and District-
Deoghar, Jharkhand.

..... ... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners : Mr. Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Someshwar Roy, A.P.P.

For the Informant : Mr. Kumar Rishab Anand, Advocate.

04/ 13.11.2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned A.P.P. for
the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection
with Deoghar Town P.S. Case No. 277 of 2025, registered for the
offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 351(4), 352, 303(2), 125(a), 3(5)
of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the court of learned Chief
Judicial Magistrate, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that
the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and allegations
are made that 10 to 12 persons have come and beaten the informant
and also snatched a chain and taken Rs. 1250/- from him. He next
submits that the petitioners are having no criminal antecedent and
disclosure to that effect has been made in para-8 of the petition. He
then submits that the privilege of anticipatory bail may kindly be
provided to the petitioners.

4. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State has opposed

the prayer and submits that in the FIR itself, the informant himself has identified the petitioners and disclosed their name. He further submits that in paras-8 and 9 of the case diary, the independent witnesses have also supported the case of the prosecution and they have also taken the name of these petitioners.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the informant also accepts the submission of learned counsel appearing for the State.

6. In the FIR itself, the informant has identified the petitioners and disclosed their names and further looking into the contents of paras-8 and 9 of the case diary, it transpires that two of the independent witnesses have also taken the name of these petitioners and further injury is also there.

7. In view of the above, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, above named. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated:-13.11.2025
Amitesh/-