IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1840 of 2026

Gulzar Ahmad aged about 46 years son of Shahabuddin Ansari, resident of Village- Tundhul, Doriya Toli, P.O.- Balalong, P.S.-Nagri, District- Ranchi ... … **Petitioner**

Versus

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

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Jitendra Shankar Singh, Advocate
For the State : Ms. Sushma Aind, A.P.P.

02/Dated: 28.04.2026

1. Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Vidahan Sabha P.S. Case No. 55 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections 109, 3(5) of the BNS and Section 27 of the Arms Act, pending in the Court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that on the same and similar offence one Sadho Munda has also lodged an F.I.R. being Vidhan Sabha P.S. Case No.56 of 2025 registered for the offence under Sections 109, 3(5) of the BNS and Section 27 of the Arms Act wherein it has been alleged that the petitioner in order to grab his land has sent Harish and Ejajullah for committing his murder. He submits that in the said case the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi in A.B.P. No. 2563 of 2025. By referring the Annexure 4 which is register II and rent receipt of the land in question he submits that the said land is in the name of Kariya Jhola, ancestor of the petitioner and hence the

claim of Sadho Munda that the petitioner wants to grab his land is false and frivolous. He submits that Ejajul Ansari and Sikandar and Gulzar Ansari have told that Sadho Munda is in possession of Adivasi land and if he is eliminated then they will come in possession of the said land. He submits that however the petitioner has never met the co-accused persons nor has asked them to commit murder of Sadho Munda. He next submits that apart from these two cases there is no case against the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and submits that the allegations are there against the petitioner.

5. It has been pointed out that for the same set of allegation in the earlier case the petitioner has been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Judicial Commissioner, Ranchi and only on the confessional statement the name of the petitioner has come in the present case and in that view of the matter, the petitioner is directed to surrender before the learned Court within two weeks from today and the learned Court shall release the petitioner on such terms, conditions or sureties as the learned Court may deem fit and proper.

6. Accordingly, this application is disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

April 28, 2026

Pramanik/-
Uploaded on 01/05/2026