

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

A.B.A. No. 1968 of 2020

---  
Amitav Kiran @ Amit Asthana ... .. Petitioner  
Versus  
1. The State of Jharkhand  
2. Sanjay Kumar Das ... .. Opp. Parties  
---

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY**

---  
For the Petitioner : Mr. Alok Anand, Advocate  
For the State : Mr. Ram Prakash Singh, A.P.P.  
---

03/07.07.2020 Defects as pointed out by the office are ignored.

Heard Mr. Alok Anand, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Ram Prakash Singh, learned A.P.P. for the State.

Earlier the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected in A.B.A. No. 330 of 2018.

Mr. Alok Anand, learned counsel for the petitioner has stated that new ground on account of which the prayer for anticipatory bail has been renewed is the order passed in Cr.M.P. No. 3782 of 2018 in which the order taking cognizance dated 03.06.2017 was set aside and the matter was remanded back to the learned court below to pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law. Learned counsel further submits that subsequently cognizance was once again taken on 10.12.2019 but the same also does not contain appropriate reasons.

Learned A.P.P. has opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

It appears that on consideration of the entire aspect of the matter including the case diary the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected in A.B.A. No. 330 of 2018. In Cr.M.P. No. 3742 of 2018 this Court had quashed the order taking cognizance and had remanded the matter back to the court below to pass a reasoned and speaking order in accordance with law, consequent to which the order dated 10.12.2019 has been passed. It would thus mean that after cognizance has been taken the entire aspect of the matter has revived and, therefore, the same cannot be a fresh ground for reconsideration of the prayer for bail. If the petitioner has a grievance with respect to the order dated 10.12.2019 he is always at liberty to challenge the same before the appropriate forum.

On consideration of the entire aspect of the matter, I do not find any reason to reconsider the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner which is accordingly rejected.

***(Rongon Mukhopadhyay, J.)***