IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 6223 of 2025

1. Sajda Khatoon, aged about 38 years, wife of Mushtak Ansari
2. Mushtak Ansari, aged about 48 years, son of Md. Yasin Ansari
Both are residents of village Neori, Near Vikas Vidyalaya, P.O. Neori, P.S. Sadar (Mesra O.P.), District-Ranchi

..... … Petitioners

Versus

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :Mr. Ramesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shree Prakash Jha, A.P.P
For the Informant : Mr. Abdul Wahab, Advocate

03/ 27.04.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State and learned counsel for the informant.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Sadar (Mesra O.P.) P.S. Case No. 181 of 2025, registered sections 316(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 3(5) of BNS, 2023, pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate-IV, Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that informant has paid only Rs. 7,26,000/- for execution of sale deed of the land. He next submits that false allegation has been made that the said land was of the another person which has been tried to be sold by the petitioners through an agreement to informant. He further submits that dispute is there that is civil in nature. On these grounds, he submits that the petitioners may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsels for the State and informant oppose the prayer and submit that there is allegation of misappropriation of huge amount by means of forgery. Learned counsel for the informant further submits that a total sum of Rs. 7, 26,000/- was paid to the petitioners by the informant and when the informant had gone to the spot then some other persons had claimed that the said land is belonging to them and not of the

petitioners.

5. A sum of Rs. 7,26,000/- was received by the petitioners and inspite of assurance the petitioners neither refunded the money received from the informant nor sold any other land to the informant. On making false assurance the petitioners have taken money and in view of that the petitioners have intention from very beginning to cheat the informant. In para 23 of the case diary it has been recorded that the petitioners have sold the said land to another person and thereafter the money was taken from the informant for selling the same land.

6. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected. Interim order dated 30.10.2025 is vacated.

Dt.27.04.2026 **(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

satyarthi-