

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 6951 of 2025

Amresh Yadav @ Amresh Kumar, aged about 24 years, S/o Late Suresh Yadav,
R/o Village- Manhu, P.O. & P.S. Chhattarpur, District- Palamu, Jharkhand

... Petitioner

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Anurag Kashyap, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Mishra, A.P.P.

05/22.04.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel
appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Chhattarpur P.S. Case No.101 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 103(2) and 3(5) of the BNS, pending in the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Palamau.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that the allegations are made that one injection was administered to the daughter of the informant and thereafter she has died. He then submits that the petitioner is happened to be son of the house owner where the deceased was residing with other friends. He next submits that friend of the deceased namely Nitu has not been examined and on her statement, the name of the petitioner has come. He also submits that the cause of death is not ascertained as viscera is still preserved. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.
4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that this petitioner has admitted in reply of notice issued under

Section 35(3) of the BNSS, 2023 that he has administered injection and that has also come in para 63 of the case diary. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may not be granted to the petitioner.

5. The allegations in the FIR itself are there of administering injection due to which the deceased has died. The deceased was residing in the house of the petitioner, who happened to be son of owner of the house. In para 63 of the case diary, the petitioner has admitted that he has administered injection.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and, as such, the prayer of anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

7. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 22nd April, 2026
Ajay/