

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 2034 of 2025

Ranjeet Mishra @ Ranjit Mishra aged about 30 years son of Ashutosh Mishra resident of Road no.17, Chunabhata, Gumti Basti, Near Railway Over Bridge, P.O.+P.S.- Aditaypur, District- Seraikella (Kharsawan)

.... **Petitioner(s).**

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

... **Opp. Party(s).**

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Arvind Kr. Choudhary, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, Addl. P.P.

.....

07/07.07.2025: Heard, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. This anticipatory bail application under Sections 482 and 484 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been preferred by the petitioner apprehending his arrest in connection to Adityapur P.S. Case No.165/2023, for offences under Sections 406/420/421/424/467/468/470/471/120B of the Indian Penal Code. The case is presently pending before the Court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Seraikella.

3. It is alleged that Rabindra Kumar Sharma and Ranjeet Sharma, who deals in sale of land, showed a piece of land to the informant in Jamalpur, Adityapur. The informant agreed to buy the land for Rs.42,00,000. The accused gave papers of the land, which stood in the name of Jitendra Nath Mishra. Rabindra Kumar Sharma falsely impersonating as Jitendra Nath Mishra signed an agreement with the informant on 9.8.2021. The informant paid Rs.21,68,000 in Ranjeet Mishra's account. Later, the accused did not execute the sale deed and the land was sold to someone else by actual Jitendra Nath Mishra. When informant asked for a refund, the accused gave several cheques, however, all the cheques got dishonoured.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is completely innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been

dragged by the informant having ulterior motive. He further submits that the petitioner has not entered into any agreement with the informant and there is no signature of the petitioner in the alleged agreement. He also submits that the bank account of petitioner was used by the co-accused without his knowledge. He further submits that there is no material evidence on record to establish that the petitioner has committed any forgery, cheating, or used fake documents. He further submits that during the investigation, the police found no proof against him, and no independent witnesses supported the case.

5. The learned APP appearing for the state has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. He submits that the petitioner is not entitled to the privilege of anticipatory bail. He further submits that the petitioner is named in FIR and petitioner had conspired with other co-accused, thus this is a case of custodial interrogation.

6. After hearing the parties and from the perusal of the impugned order, I find that the allegations against the petitioner is serious in nature.

The informant has supported his version in his re-statements. The other witnesses, who have been examined during investigation, have also supported the informant's version regarding the alleged occurrence. It clearly shows that the petitioner has cheated the informant by fraudulently taking a large amount of money. Further this is a case of impersonation also as the real land owner has been impersonated. Huge amount has been transferred in account of this petitioner. Hence, the Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, as this case needs investigation in presence of this petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Anticipatory Bail Application stands **dismissed**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)