

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No.6263 of 2021

Guljar Ansari @ Md. Guljar Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Rajneesh Vardhan, Addl.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 07.09.2021

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 Jagannathpur P.S. Case No.23 of 2021 registered under Sections 392, 395, 412, 120B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 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 was involved in commission of dacoity and received the looted property of the dacoity. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Md. Salim. It is next submitted that the co-accused- Rajendra Laguri has given his share of looted money i.e. Rs.3,00,000/- and the pistol used in the occurrence to the petitioner. It is also submitted that the informant has since been arrested in connection with this case as he was also involved in the crime. 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 the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case for the recovery of the looted money and the pistol used in the occurrence.

Therefore, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner of being involved in dacoity of Rs.15,00,000/- 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/