

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 7323 of 2025

Balram Kumar Gupta @ Balram Kr. Gupta, aged about 45 years, son of Ram Sankar Prasad, resident of H N-C-2/17-A, Bhagwati Garden EXTN, D.K. Mohan Garden, P.O. and P.S. Uttam Nagar, District-Dwarka (New Delhi), State-Delhi

..... ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

..... ... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner

:Mr. J.N. Upadhyay, Advocate

For the State

: Mr. Sunil Kumar Dubey, A.P.P.

For the Informant

: Mr. Jitendra Shankar Singh, Advocate.

03/ 07.05.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bermo P.S. Case No. 60 of 2023, corresponding to G.R. Case No. 569 of 2023, registered under sections 406, 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M, Bermo at Tenughat.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier the petitioner has moved in A.B.A. No. 2711 of 2025 and considering that petitioner has complied notice under section 35(3) of BNS, 2023 and no apprehension of arrest is there in view of that said anticipatory bail application was disposed of. Thereafter the petitioner has again moved in A.B.A. No. 6395 of 2025 which was directly filed before this Court and in view of that said anticipatory bail application was disposed of with liberty to move before the learned Sessions Judge and thereafter the petitioner has moved before the learned Sessions Judge which has been rejected. He next submits that petitioner is not partner of the said company and allegation of defalcation of money is not correct so far this petitioner is concerned and in view of that the petitioner may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory

bail.

4. Learned counsels for the State and informant vehemently oppose the prayer and submit that petitioner has already appeared before the I.O. and thereafter the petitioner stopped cooperating in the investigation and in view of that non-bailable warrant of arrest has been issued against the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that petitioner has several criminal antecedents and he is charged under the Gangster Act in the State of Uttar Pradesh and in this regard he produced certified copy of order passed by the Committee constituted under the Gangster Act. He also submits that allegation is there of defalcation of Rs. 25,00,000/- of the informant for selling of land for business and after taking money from the informant neither the sale deed was executed nor the said money was returned. He next submits that petitioner is having several criminal antecedents in the District of Mirzapur, Uttar Pradesh and also in the State of Jharkhand. Further it has been pointed out that one Deepak Kumar is associate of this petitioner whose anticipatory bail being A.B.A. No. 5047 of 2205 has been rejected by this Court and in view of that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner may kindly be rejected.

6. The anticipatory bail applications of the petitioner have already been disposed of in the aforesaid manner. The petitioner is not cooperating in the investigation and thereafter non-bailable warrant of arrest has been issued against the petitioner. The petitioner has defalcated Rs. 25,00,000/- of the informant and anticipatory bail of the co-accused has already been rejected by this Court in A.B.A. No. 5047 of 2025. Further the petitioner is having several criminal antecedents in the State of Uttar Pradesh and in the

State of Jharkhand.

7. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

Dt.07.05.2026

satyarthi-

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)