

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 5349 of 2025

Bahar Sk @ Kalmek Sk @ Mohamoddin Sk, aged about 41
years, S/o Jayeda Bibi and Late Dilkush Sk, R/o village –
Joypur, PO – Narayanpur, PS – Rampurhat, District – Birbhum,
West Bengal, 731223

.... Petitioner

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :- Md. Faruque Ansari, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Sanjay Kr. Srivastava, Advocate

03/13.11.2025 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner as well
as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Pakuria P.S. Case No.27 of 2025 for the alleged offences registered
under Sections 103(1), 238 and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita,
2023 pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Pakur.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that
only on suspicion the name of the petitioner has come. He further
submits that false allegation of illicit relationship with the wife of the
deceased has been made against the petitioner. He then submits
that sanha was made on 17.05.2025 and the dead body of the
deceased was found on 19.05.2025 and thereafter the FIR has been
registered. On these grounds, he submits that the anticipatory bail

may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and submits that the motive against the petitioner is there in light of paragraph No.31 of case diary wherein the CDR report has been recorded. He submits that on that day there is several call between the wife of the deceased and this petitioner and the independent witnesses in paragraph Nos.17 to 20 have supported the prosecution case and in view of that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

5. Considering that it has come that the petitioner was in relationship with the wife of the deceased and in paragraph No.31 of the case diary in the CDR report it has come that on that day several times talk took place between the wife of the deceased and the petitioner and in paragraph Nos.17 to 20 independent witnesses have supported the case of the prosecution, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated 13.11.2025
Sangam/*