IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 466 of 2026

Sanjay Goswami (aged about 35 years) son of Badhan Goswami, resident of Village- Telonary Tola, Kharkhar, P.O. Bengabad, P.S. Bengabad, District-Giridih **... Petitioner**

-Versus-

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

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ram Lakhan Yadav, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Sinha, A.P.P.

08/05.05.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bengabad P.S. Case No.08/2025, dated 14.01.2025, registered for the offence under Sections 126(2), 115(2), 109(1), 76, 324(2), 351(1), 3(5) of the BNS, pending in the Court of the learned C.J.M., Giridih.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. He further submits that it is impossible that a person who is having sword, will threaten and also molest the informant. According to him, nothing has been done by the petitioner and even injury is found to be simple and in view of that, anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that serious allegations are there of touching inappropriately to the informant and even assault has been made upon the husband and brother-in-law of the informant. On these grounds, he submits that the prayer for anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Looking into the contents of the FIR, it transpires that the allegations are there of forcefully entering into the house of the informant and blowing injury on the head by sword and outraging the modesty of the informant and when her husband come to rescue the informant, the petitioner has also assaulted her husband and brother-in-law. It has also been alleged that prior to the said incident, the petitioner had also teased the informant. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and, as such, his prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

7. However, it is open to the petitioner to comply with the observation made by the learned Sessions Judge.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 5th May, 2026
Ajay/