IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 1993 of 2026

1. Pritam Kumar @ Pritam Prasad Soni @ Pritam, aged about 33 years, son of Kanhaiya Lal.
2. Akshay Soni @ Akshay Kumar, aged about 29 years, son of Amulya Prasad.
3. Pintu Prasad @ Pinku Prasad, aged about 39 years, son of Umesh Prasad.
4. Nandlal Prasad, aged about 44 years, son of Lil Mohan Saw.
5. Ritik Kumar, aged about 25 years, son of Manoj Prasad.
6. Manoj Prasad, aged about 55 years, Jagan Saw.
7. Akshay Kumar Soni, aged about 26 years, son of Arun Saw.
8. Tinku Prasad @ Tinku Soni, aged about 35 years, son of Arun Saw.
9. Aman Kumar, aged about 29 years, son of Kartik Prasad.
10. Suraj Kumar, aged about 27 years, son of Niranjan Prasad.
11. Uday Kumar, aged about 24 years, son of Kartik Prasad.
12. Akash Verma, aged about 19 years, son of Ranjeet Kumar.
13. Mantu Kumar, aged about 28 years, son of Dharmendra Mahto.
14. Mukesh Kumar, aged about 31 years, son of Ishwar Saw.
15. Mithlesh Prasad, aged about 45 years, son of Horil Saw.
16. Raj Kumar Prasad, aged about 48 years, son of Dashrath Prasad.
    All are residents of Village Sukarigarha, P.O. Lari, P.S. Rajrappa, District Ramgarh, Jharkhand.
17. Ganesh Munda, aged about 23 years, son of Sugan Munda, resident of Village Chikor, Pahan Tola, P.O. Bhadaninagar, P.S. Patratu (Bhadaninagar O.P.), District Ramgarh, Jha
    .

..... … Petitioners

Versus

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :Md. Zaid Ahmed, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Lily Sahay, A.P.P.

02/ 04.05.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Rajrappa P.S. Case No. 19 of 2026, registered under sections 191(2), 190, 61, 127(2), 121(1), 121(2), 132, 109(1), 119(2), 352 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, pending in the Court of learned S.D.J.M, Ramgarh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in the F.I.R. forty four named accused persons and 150 unknown persons are there and

allegations are made that altercation took place due to not making emersion of deity in Saraswati Puja at prescribed place. He next submits that there are general and omnibus allegation against all the accused persons. On these grounds, he submits that the petitioners may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that altercation took place due to not making emersion of deity in Saraswati Puja at prescribed place.

5. Looking into contents of F.I.R, it transpires that there is general and omnibus allegation against 44 named accused persons and 150 unknown persons and altercation took place due to not making emersion of deity in Saraswati Puja at prescribed place, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, the above named, petitioners are directed to surrender before the learned court within three weeks from today and in the event of their surrender / arrest, the petitioners shall be released on bail, on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 25,000/- (twenty five thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each, to the satisfaction of learned S.D.J.M, Ramgarh, in connection with Rajrappa P.S. Case No. 19 of 2026, subject to conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of B.N.S.S, 2023.

Dt.04.05.2026 **(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

satyarthi-