

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 7079 of 2025

Rajendra Singh, Son of Ganesh Singh	...	...	Petitioner
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand	...	...	Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Rajeeva Sharma, Sr. Advocate
For the Opp. Party	: Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate
	Mr. Ritesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
	Mr. Nillohit Choubey, Advocate

06/23rd April 2026

1. This anticipatory bail application has been filed in connection with Hazaribag Vigilance P.S. Case No. 11/2025 for offence registered under Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act and Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, said to be pending in the court of learned Special Judge (Vigilance) Hazaribag.
2. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is the Circle Inspector, on whose recommendation, the mutation has been done. He has referred to the report annexed along with the counter-affidavit and has submitted that the entire history of the property bearing Khata No. 95 has been mentioned therein indicating that the property was purchased by Bhim Nath Mahto, grand-father of the vendor, vide sale deed no. 129 of 1919 and then Jamabandi was subsequently created in the name of the grand-mother of the vendor, namely, Kapuri Devi and the rent receipts were also being issued in her name and she was in possession of the property. He has also submitted that while making recommendation, a reference to the return filed by the Zamindar was also mentioned. He submits that there is no long standing Jamabandi in connection with the property involved in this case.

3. The learned counsel submits that the petitioner has no role in the alleged offence and the recommendation was made on the basis of materials discussed in the recommendation. He submits that no offence is made out.

4. Learned counsel for the opposite party while opposing the prayer has referred to page 17 of the counter-affidavit and has submitted that a list of the property, all in relation to khata no. 95, was already available with the petitioner in connection with which the property was said to be forest land and mutation was not to be done with respect to those properties, but in spite of that the petitioner had recommended mutation being Circle Inspector.

5. The learned counsel for the opposite party has referred to paragraph 15, 16 and 18 of the anticipatory bail application and has submitted that it is the case of the petitioner that he had initially made the recommendation denying mutation, but ultimately he was pressurized by the co-accused, namely, Vinay Kumar Choubey, who was then then Deputy Commissioner, who had asked him to change the recommendation and consequently he had changed the recommendation.

6. The learned counsel submits that the order dated 12.12.2025 was drawn by this Court in this case wherein the fact that, the petitioner wanted to co-operate with the investigation, has been recorded and it was also mentioned that if the petitioner is ready to comply the statement made in paragraph 18 of the anticipatory bail application and he may cooperate with the ACB, the ACB will not harass the petitioner unnecessarily. The learned counsel submits that in spite of that order, there was no co-operation from the side of the petitioner and on the face of the statement made by the petitioner in the anticipatory bail application, his role in the alleged offence cannot be denied.

7. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the supplementary affidavit and has submitted that the petitioner had gone to the office of ACB, Hazaribag along with his son to cooperate with the

investigation, but the ACB, Hazaribag did not entertain the petitioner and did not record his statement.

8. In response, the learned counsel for the opposite party, on instructions, has submitted that it was only the son of the petitioner who approached and the petitioner never approached and consequently the statement of the son of the petitioner could not have been recorded. However, he submits that in view of the statement made in the anticipatory bail application itself and in view of the Annexure-A, page 17, of the counter-affidavit, the petitioner may not be enlarged on anticipatory bail. It is also submitted that the connected records with respect to the property involved in this case are missing.

9. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the aforesaid statements made in the anticipatory bail application itself, this the role of the petitioner along with other co-accused in the alleged offence in the matter of mutation of forest land cannot be denied at this stage and certainly the petitioner is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

10. It further appears from the counter-affidavit that the connected records with respect to the property involved in this case has gone missing and therefore the likelihood of the petitioner tempering with the evidence also cannot be ruled out.

11. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Hence, this anticipatory bail application is rejected.

12. Let a soft copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through 'e-mail/FAX'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 23.04.2026

Uploaded On:

Mukul/-