2026:JHHC:25548

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 4798 of 2026

Santosh Paswan, aged about 53 years, son of Fanindra Kumar, resident of Village Punasi, PO Punasi, PO Punasi, PS Jasidih, District Deoghar, Jharkhand .... Petitioner

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand .... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner	:-	Mr. Arvind Kumar Choudhary, Advocate
For the State	:-	Ms.Sushma Aind, Advocate
For the Informant	:-	Mr. Lakhan Chandra Roy, Advocate

---

*2/**24.08.2026*** Heard learned counsels for petitioner and for State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Jasidih PS Case No.117 of 2026, for offence registered under section 64(1) of BNS, 2023, pending in court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Deoghar.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and false allegations are made against the petitioner of establishing relationship and blackmailing the informant and further the allegations are made only because the petitioner is Vice Chairman of Zilla Parishad, Deoghar. He submits in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned State counsel as well as the learned counsel appearing for the informant jointly oppose the prayer and submit that serious allegations are there against the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel for the informant further adds that this

petitioner is having 10 criminal antecedents and serious allegations are there and the informant was lured by the petitioner when she was in trouble while theft was made in her house and alluring the informant that he will help, he has forcibly established relationship and on these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

6. In the FIR it transpires that there is direct allegation against the petitioner of threatening the informant as well as her husband. It has been alleged that a theft has taken place in the house of the informant and for that, she was trying to have proper investigation and in the garb of that, this petitioner has established relationship with the informant and it has come in the order of the learned Sessions Judge that in paragraph no.38, 39 and 40 of the case diary, the I.O has incorporated the extract of perusal of CCTV of the place of occurrence which was a rented house and in which victim was residing and it is mentioned by the I.O that accused/petitioner was found entering into that house on 17.03.2026 and on 20.03.2026 he was found coming out from the said house and threatening the informant and the petitioner is having 10 criminal antecedent as stated by the learned counsel for the informant, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is, hereby, rejected, and consequently, A.B.A. No.4798 of 2026 is, hereby, dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

24.08.2026
SI/