IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3351 of 2026

Tanjir Seakh, aged about 21 years, S/o Safruddin Seakh, R/o Village- Sikri, P.O. & P.S. Gumla, District- Gumla (Jharkhand) **... Petitioner**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand **... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kripa Shankar Nanda, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Prabir Kumar Chatterjee, Spl.P.P.

02/29.06.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kersai P.S. Case No.10/2026, registered for the offence under Sections 317(5), 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 11(D)(F) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animal Act and Section 12(1), 12(2), 12(3) of Jharkhand Bovine Animal Prohibition of Slaughter Act, 2005, pending in the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Simdega.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner happened to be owner of Mahindra Bolero Maxx pickup van and the allegations are made of carrying bovine animals on the said vehicle. He further submits that the bovine animals were booked by another person. He next submits that the petitioner is having one criminal antecedent and that is under Section 11 of the Prevention to Cruelty to Animal Act. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that the petitioner is having criminal antecedent of same nature and that has also come in the order of the learned Additional Sessions Judge-I, Simdega.

5. Considering that the petitioner is the owner of the said vehicle and he is having one criminal antecedent of same nature and it cannot be a co-incident that every time the bovine animals are being carried and the petitioner is not knowing the same and in the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and, as such, his prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 29th June, 2026
Ajay/