

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.2370 of 2021

Jisu Kumar @ Jishu Kumar Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. R. S. Mazumdar, Sr. Advocate
For the State : Ms. Priya Shrestha, Spl.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 05.04.2021

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Apprehending his arrest in connection with Jorapokhar P.S. Case No.05 of 2021 instituted under Sections 302, 120-B, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25 (1-B) (a), 27, 35 of the Arms Act, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner, along with co-accused persons, and in furtherance of their common intention, has committed the murder of the brother of the informant namely Ranjit Singh. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that the main allegation of shooting at the deceased is upon Sanan Prasad Verma and Swaran Kamal Singh and the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of their confessional statement made before police and except that, there is no other material to implicate the petitioner in this case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned Spl.P.P appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that the co-accused persons have categorically stated about the involvement of the petitioner in criminal conspiracy for committing the murder of Ranjit Singh. It is next submitted that the petitioner is having criminal antecedent as he is also involved in Jorapokhar P.S. Case No.99 of 2019 inter alia for the offences punishable under Sections 147, 148, 149, 341, 323, 325, 326 and 307 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Section 27 of the Arms Act. It is then submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case to find out details of the case. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the

privileges 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/