

Neutral Citation No. (2025:JHHC:34919)
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A No. 8623 of 2025

1. Izhar Hussain, son of Late Bara Babu, aged about 54 years, resident of village Ukrid Basti, P.O & P.S. Sector 12, Bokaro Steel City, Bokaro, District Bokaro, Jharkhand
2. Akthtar Hussain, son of Late Bara Babu, aged about 52 years, resident of village Ukrid Basti, P.O & P.S. Sector 12, Bokaro Steel City, Bokaro, District Bokaro, Jharkhand

--- --- Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand through C.I.D --- --- Opp. Party

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ambuj Nath

For the Petitioners: Mr. Indrajit Sinha & Ms. Ankita Monika, Advocates

For the O.P-State: Mr. Manoj Kumar, G.A-III
 Mr. Aditya Raman, A.C to G.A-III

06 / 24.11.2025 Heard the parties.

2. Petitioners have been made accused in connection with C.I.D. P.S. Case No. 04 of 2025 for the offences registered under sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code and sections 30 and 63 of the Indian Forest Act, pending in the court of learned A.J.C.-XVIII-cum-Special Judge, CID, Ranchi.
3. The petitioners had claimed their ownership over several plots of the land situated in Mouza Tetulia, which allegedly belonged to the Forest Department. Name of the petitioners were entered into the revenue records and thereafter, land was sold to several persons.
4. State has not only challenged the entry of the name of the petitioners made in the revenue records, but also cancelled the same. Being aggrieved by the order of cancellation of entry of their names in the revenue records, petitioners moved this Court by filing a writ application. Learned Single Bench of this Court set aside the order of cancelation of their name from the revenue records. Against the order of the learned single Judge, State preferred L.P.A. before the Division Bench of this Court which was also dismissed. The State finally filed S.L.P before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which was also dismissed. The present position is that the name of the petitioners, as entered into the revenue records, has been found to be legal up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
5. Subsequently, State has initiated a criminal case against the petitioners, stating therein that the petitioners had forged the documents and by using forged documents, they got their names mutated in the revenue records with regard to the aforesaid land. It appears that the State had filed a criminal case which was quashed by the single Judge of this Court.

6. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail and submitted that the name of the petitioners was entered into the revenue records in connivance with the Government officials. It was further submitted that mutation case number by virtue of which, name of the petitioners was entered into the revenue records, was actually filed by one Dimple Devi, who had no connection with the present case, and after manipulating the official record, names of these petitioners have been entered in the revenue records. It was further submitted that the recorded tenant had filed a Title Suit against the State Government for declaration of their possession with regard to the same land. This Title Suit was dismissed. He further submitted that the petitioners are claiming ownership over the land by virtue of a gift deed which was executed in 2004 and the donee had claimed that the entire land in question was settled to the donee in the year 1937. It was also submitted that the name of the petitioners was entered into the revenue records with respect to the land having an area of 1.03 acres, but by manipulation, area of the land has been shown to be 103 acres. It was also submitted that earlier, petitioners have also produced a sale deed which was said to be executed in 1984 showing that they had purchased the land measuring 2.75 acres from the rightful owners.

7. All the grounds which have been taken by the State before this court were available to them when the petitioner had filed the writ application before the single Bench of this Court, when their mutation was cancelled. However, these grounds were neither taken in the writ application, nor in the L.P.A, nor before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. State had earlier filed a criminal case with regard to the same matter, which was quashed by the learned single Bench of this court.

8. Considering the aforesaid facts, I am inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail. Accordingly, petitioners, above named, are directed to be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) each, with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned A.J.C.-XVIII-cum-Special Judge, CID, Ranchi in connection with C.I.D. P.S. Case No. 04 of 2025.

(Ambuj Nath, J)

November 24, 2025

Ranjeet/
Uploaded