IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 3093 of 2026

1. Ajay Kumar, aged about 54 years, son of Shyam Narayan Sinha, resident of Near Nayak Dhaba, Chuttupalu, P.S. Ormanjhi, P.O. Chuttupalu, District-Ranchi, Jharkhand
2. Basant Prasad @ Basant Prasad Mehta, aged abut 44 years, son of Mahadev Mahto, resident of Jara Tola, Gaushala Road, P.S. Ramgarh, P.O. Ramgarh, District-Ramgarh, Jharkhand

..... …Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ..... … Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :Mr. B.M. Tripathi, Sr. Advocate
Mr. N.K. Jaiswal, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Prabir Kumar Chatterjee, Spl. P.P.

02/ 16.06.2026: Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Ormanjhi P.S. Case No. 23 of 2025, registered under section 303(2) of BNS and under section 21 of M.M.D.R.T Act, under Rule 54 of J.M.M.C Rules, 2004 and under Rule 13 of J.M.P.I.M.P.T. Rules, 2017 pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate-XV, Ranchi.

3. Mr. B.M. Tripathi, learned senior counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have earlier moved before this Court in A.B.A. No.2035 of 2025 which was dismissed as withdrawn by order dated 07.07.2025. He further submits that on the fresh ground second anticipatory bail has been filed however, the learned Sessions Judge has been pleased to reject the same. He submits that even the crusher and land on which crusher is installed, is not belonging to the petitioner and in view of that the anticipatory bail may kindly be allowed.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that what has been argued by the learned senior counsel for the petitioners

was already argued at the time of hearing of earlier anticipatory bail application however, the earlier application was dismissed as withdrawn. He submits that there is no fresh ground in the second anticipatory bail application and the learned Sessions Judge has rightly rejected the anticipatory bail application. He next submits that earlier movement has not been disclosed in the main anticipatory bail application and subsequently by way of supplementary affidavit disclosure of earlier movement has been made and in that view of the matter the anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. There is no doubt that second anticipatory bail application can be maintained on the fresh ground. However, it transpires that what has been argued by the learned senior counsel for the petitioners in the present anticipatory bail application was already argued at the time of hearing of earlier anticipatory bail application which has been dismissed as withdrawn. In course of argument no fresh ground has been argued. Earlier anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioners has been dismissed as withdrawn. Accordingly, this anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Dt.16.06.2026 **(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

satyarthi-