

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**A.B.A. No. 6298 of 2021**

-----

Indradeep Nayak	...	Petitioner
	Versus	
The State of Jharkhand	...	Opposite Party

-----

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

-----

For the Petitioner	: Mr. P.K. Mukhopadhyay, Advocate
For the State	: Mr. P.K. Chatterjee, Spl. P.P.

-----

**Order No.02 Dated- 07.09.2021**

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner 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 petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Apprehending his arrest, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail in connection with Mandu (Kujju) P.S. Case No.61 of 2021 registered under sections 420/467/468/469/471/34 of the Indian Penal Code and under Section 30 of Coal Mines (Nationalization) Act.

The Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner supplied coal to the co-accused persons on behalf of lifter Md. Hanif and the co-accused persons disclosed that Shankar Prasad of Kujju used to prepare forged papers and it is further alleged that the petitioner is a member of racket involving trade of illegal coal on the basis of forged documents. It is further submitted that the allegations against the petitioner are all false. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Learned Spl. P.P. on the other hand vehemently opposes the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail and submits that the petitioner is involved in forging of documents and his custodial interrogation is required during the investigation of the case to find out the

details of conspiracy and also the details of forgery. Hence, 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 as well as 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 above named petitioner be given the privilege of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of privilege of anticipatory bail of the above named petitioner is rejected.

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

Gunjan-