

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No. 6489 of 2021**

-----

1. Akal Mochi @ Kauleshwar Ram		
2. Nanhu Mochi @ Nanu Mochi		
3. Sakindra Das		
4. Umesh Das		
5. Dhariman Das		
6. Manoj Das @ Manoj Ram	...	Petitioner
Versus		
The State of Jharkhand	...	Opposite Party

-----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY**

-----

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Rajesh Kr. Singh, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Shailesh Kr. Sinha, Addl. P.P.

-----

**Order No.02 Dated- 09.09.2021**

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioners personally undertakes to remove the defects as pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown period is over.

In view of the personal undertaking of the learned counsel for the petitioners, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending their arrest, the petitioners have moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Kunda P.S. Case No.76 of 2020 registered under sections 147/341/323/353/427/506 of the Indian Penal Code.

The Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners encroached over the forest land and forcibly took away the accused of the case and apprehended by the forest officers from the forest officials and used criminal force against them deterring them from discharging their duties. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioners are all false. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the

custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required for getting arrested the absconding accused person whom the petitioners have got released from the custody of the forest officials. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioners ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioners as well as the requirement of their custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above named petitioners be given the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail of the above named petitioners is rejected.

**(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)**

Sonu/Gunjan-