

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. No. 10847 of 2025

Ashok Ram, s/o Ashish Ram, aged about 48 years old, R/o village
Khaskojora, colliery, P.O. and P.S. Andal, District Paschim
Bardhaman, West Bengal **Petitioner**
Versus
State of Jharkhand **Opp. Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ashutosh Gupta, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Sweta Singh, A.P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Rahul Pandey, Advocate

06/17.02.2026 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is in custody since 06.11.2024 in connection with Jamtara P.S. Case No. 145 of 2021, corresponding to G.R. No. 249 of 2022, registered under Sections 323,467,468,406,420,504,506,34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 138 of the N.I. Act wherein cognizance has been taken under Sections 323, 467,468,406,420,504 of IPC and Section 138 of N.I. Act, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Jamtara.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was earlier granted bail vide order dated 16th December, 2022 in B.A. No. 8143 of 2022 on some condition as the petitioner agreed to execute the sale deed arising out of the agreement of sale in favour of the informant wherein it has also been recorded that the petitioner also admitted receipt of Rs. 17,20,000/-. He submits that on account of intervening circumstances, the sale deed could not be executed as one of the directors of the company involved in this case had expired. The learned counsel has also submitted that the persons who took part in negotiation have been enlarged on anticipatory bail vide order dated 29.08.2022 and the petitioner is in custody since 06.11.2024. He has submitted that out of 6 witnesses, 4 witnesses have already been examined.

3. Learned counsel for the informant has opposed the prayer and has submitted that the petitioner did not comply with his own

undertaking recorded in the order dated 16.12.2022 in B.A. No. 8143 of 2022 and therefore his bail has been cancelled. He has also submitted that the trial is at advance stage.

4. It is recorded in the order granting bail to the petitioner that the petitioner was granted bail on account of certain submission that he was ready to execute the sale deed and has also submitted that he has received Rs. 17,20,000/-. As per the allegation, an agreement was entered into between the petitioner and the informant. While granting anticipatory bail to other co-accused it has been recorded that the allegations are centered around the present petitioner and since the present petitioner was already in custody, anticipatory bail to the co-accused was allowed.

5. This court finds that the trial is in advance stage and there is direct allegation against the petitioner, in such circumstances, this court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner above named on bail. Accordingly, prayer for bail of the petitioner above named is rejected.

6. State is directed to ensure prompt production of the witnesses.

7. The learned counsel for the State is directed to communicate this order to the concerned authorities of the State to ensure compliance.

8. Let this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/e-mail.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated:17.02.2026

Uploaded on:18.02.2026

Binit/