

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No.6181 of 2021**

-----  
Ainul Khan @ Raju Khan            ....    ....    ....    Petitioner  
Versus  
The State of Jharkhand             ....    ....    ....    Opposite Party  
-----

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

-----  
For the Petitioner            : Mrs. Jasvinder Mazumdar, Advocate  
   Mr. R. S. Mazumdar, Sr. Advocate  
For the State                 : Mr. Vineet Kr. Vashistha, Addl.P.P  
-----

**Order No.02 Dated- 06.09.2021**

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

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

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

Apprehending his arrest in connection with Nirsa (Kalubathan) P.S. Case No.115 of 2021 registered under Sections 395 and 412 of the Indian Penal Code, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner has committed dacoity and looted various articles on gun point including wire, transformer, spare parts made of copper cable and other valuables worth Rs.15-17 lakh from the grid of J.V.S.N.L. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is next submitted that the petitioner was neither present at the place of occurrence nor was he seen at the spot. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Addl.P.P appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that there is serious allegation against the petitioner of having committed dacoity and looted articles worth several lakhs of rupees. Hence, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case for the recovery of the looted articles and to find out the details of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation and the requirement of his

custodial interrogation during the investigation of the case, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the privileges of anticipatory bail be given to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

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

Animesh/