**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**
**A.B.A. No. 2096 of 2020**

Gaurav Mahato ... … petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... … Opposite Parties

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

**-----**

For the petitioner : Mr. Raj Nandan Chatterjee, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ravi Prakash, Spl.P.P, NDPS

**-----**

03/20.07.2020 The present anticipatory bail application is taken up today through Video conferencing.

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Saraidhela P.S. Case No. 149 of 2019 for the offence punishable under Sections 147/148/149/307/323/324/341/342/354/379/506/509/ of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Dhanbad.

The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and has not committed any offence as alleged in the complaint leading to lodging of the F.I.R. under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. It is further submitted that earlier also in the year 2017, the informant had lodged an F.I.R. leading to institution of Saraidhela P.S. Case No. 54/2017 alleging that the petitioner had committed rape upon her. However, after facing the trial, the petitioner has been acquitted in the said case. It is further submitted that the informant has lodged the present F.I.R. only to pressurize the petitioner to marry her. Hence, the petitioner may be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Mr. Ravi Prakash, the learned Spl.P.P, NDPS while opposing the petitioner's prayer for anticipatory bail submits that the petitioner got acquitted in the earlier case due to compromise entered into between the petitioner and the informant wherein he had agreed that he would solemnize marriage with the informant. There being specific allegation against the petitioner, he may not be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Hence, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

Manish