IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No.3624 of 2020

Asraf Ansari .... …. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ....Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Indu Shekhar Gupta, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ashok Kumar, A.P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 14.09.2020

Heard the parties through video conferencing.

Apprehending his arrest in connection with Masalia P.S. Case No.01 of 2020 instituted under Sections 341, 323, 504, 353, 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, the petitioner has moved this Court for grant of privileges of anticipatory bail.

Mr. Indu Shekhar Gupta- learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter within two weeks after the lockdown is over.

In view of personal undertaking given by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the defects pointed out by the stamp reporter are ignored for the present.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that when the forest personnel were cleaning the bushes, eleven logs of wood of *semal* variety after seizing the same from a tractor, the petitioner manhandled the informant and forcibly got released the logs of wood and police could got recovered only four logs of wood and still seven logs have been kept hidden by the petitioner somewhere. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Learned A.P.P appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the

petitioner and submits that the petitioner is a history sitter as he is also involved in two other cases of similar nature. It is next submitted that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required during the investigation of the case for recovery of the seven numbers of logs of wood which have been taken by him. Hence, it is submitted that the petitioner ought not to be given the privileges of anticipatory bail.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the requirement of his custodial interrogation for recovery of the looted articles by him and his criminal antecedent, this Court is of the considered view that it 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/