IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 7450 of 2025
----

1. Aman Kumar Saw, aged about 31 years, son of Pradeep Saw, resident of village – Mirzaganj, Azad Road, PO – Mirjaganj, PS – Jamua, District – Giridih

2. Ranjit Kumar Saw, aged about 29 years, son of Bijay Kumar Saw, resident of village – Baddiha, PO – Mirzaganj, PS – Jamua, District - Giridih **.... Petitioners**

-- Versus --

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :- Mr. Shailendra Jit, Advocate
For the State :- Mr. Vineet Kr. Vashistha, Advocate
For the Informant :- Mr. Sameer Saurabh, Advocate

---

*02/**22.12.2025*** Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, learned counsel appearing for the State and learned counsel appearing for the Informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Jamua P.S. Case No. 34 of 2025, for the offence registered under Sections 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Giridih.

3. By way of inviting the attention of this Court to the contents of the FIR, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has entered into an agreement with the informant to purchase the land in question on total consideration amount of Rs. 01 crore and 45 lakhs and Rupees 14 lakh has been paid as advance. He submits that

however, the sale deed is not executed as yet and, in the meantime, Bishu Mirza and others have sold the land to another person by sale deed dated 06.09.2024. He next submits that only allegation made against the petitioner is that the petitioner in connivance with Bishu Mirza and others, the said land was sold to another person by Bishu Mirza and others. He submits apart from that, there is no other allegation against the petitioner. He also submits that in the sale-deed, the petitioner is not signatory and even he is not the witness on the sale deed. He next submits that Giridhar Gopal Sao, who has purchased the said land by way of second transaction, filed Original Suit No.253 of 2024 against the informant and in the suit also, the petitioner is not implicated as defendant. He also submits that in identical situation co-accused persons have already been granted anticipatory bail in ABA Nos.6226 of 2025 and 6931 of 2025. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that in the case diary, it has come that the land belongs to the informant and the agreement has been entered between the informant and the petitioner.

5. Mr. Sameer Saurabh, learned counsel appearing for the informant vehemently opposed the prayer of anticipatory bail and submitted that these petitioners have connived with Bishu Mirza and others in the second transaction, however, he has admitted that the agreement was earlier between the petitioner and the informant and a sum of Rs.14 lakh was paid to the informant. He also draws the attention of the Court to the order of the Circle Officer, Jamua, Giridih and submitted that the connivance part of the petitioner is also there in the

said order. He also submits that after filing of the original suit, Giridhar Gopal Saw has further sold the land to another person.

6. In view of the above submissions of the learned counsel appearing for the parties and looking into the materials on record, it transpires, in the FIR itself it is stated that the petitioner has entered into agreement with the informant for the purchase of the land in question on total consideration amount of Rs.01 crore and 45 lakhs and the petitioner has paid a sum of Rs.14 lakhs as an advance. In the order of the Circle Officer, it has only been stated that the petitioner has connived with Bishu Mirza and others in selling of the land by way of second transaction. Apart from this, there is no other allegation against the petitioner and further the original Suit No.253 of 2024 has been filed by Giridhar Gopal Sao, who is the purchaser by way of the second transaction and in the suit also the petitioner has not been arrayed as defendant and in identical situation co-accused person has already been granted anticipatory bail in the aforesaid ABAs.

7. In that view of the facts, the petitioners, above named are directed to surrender before the learned Court within four weeks and the learned Court shall release the petitioners on such terms and condition or sureties, the learned Court may deem fit and proper.

8. This Anticipatory Bail Application is accordingly disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 22.12.2025
Sangam/