

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 5541 of 2025

Vidhyasagar Mandal, @ Biddasagar Mandal, aged about-16 years Son of Ajay Mandal, Resident of Village-Chamrachak Barari, P.O. Ganeshpur, P.S. Barharwa, District-Sahibganj, represented through Kalpna Devi, wife of Ajay Mandal, Resident of Village-Chamrachak Barari, P.O. Ganeshpur, P.S. Barharwa, District-Sahibganj, Natural Guardian and Mother of the petitioner.

..... ... Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand
..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Gautam Kumar, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. S.K. Keshri, A.P.P.
For the Informant : Mr. Raja Ravi Shekhar Singh, Advocate.

03/ 25.11.2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Barharwa P.S. Case No. 147 of 2025, registered for the offences under Sections 126(1), 115(2), 118(1), 109(1), 351(2) and 3(5) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Rajmahal.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the allegation of assault and causing grievous injury to the injured is not against this petitioner. He next submits that in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be provided to the petitioner.

4. Learned A.P.P. appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the informant have vehemently opposed the prayer and

jointly submit that by way of sickle, several blows have been made and one finger has been cut and further the wrist has been amputated of one Ramnath Mandal.

5. In view of the submissions of the parties and looking into the contents of the FIR as well as the materials come in the case diary, it transpires that the petitioner is named in the FIR and there is direct allegation against the petitioner and others of making assault, due to that the left wrist has been amputated and further materials are also there in paras-8, 9, 15, 19, 35, 53, 60 and 61 of the case diary against the petitioner.

6. In view of the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to provide the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated:-25.11.2025
Amitesh/-