**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

A.B.A. No. 1898 of 2025

**---**

Arbind Yadav @ Arvind Kumar Yadav son of Nanku Yadav, resident of Village- Jhardag, P.O. & P.S.- Lawalaung, District- Chatra … … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand …. … Opp. Party

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ritik Raj, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Achinto Sen, A.P.P.

**Order No. 02** **Dated: 28.03.2025**

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest for the offences punishable under Sections 376/511/323/506/379 of the Indian Penal Code in connection with Lawalong P.S. Case No. 74 of 2023 pending the court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chatra.

**2.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner's anticipatory bail application was earlier rejected by this Court vide order dated 18.07.2024 passed in A.B.A. No. 4781 of 2024. By way of present anticipatory bail application, the petitioner has renewed his prayer for grant of anticipatory bail.

**3.** It is further submitted that in course of investigation, the police has recorded the statements of witnesses namely Kavita Devi and Tulsimani Devi under Section 161 of Cr.P.C. who have clearly stated that no such occurrence had taken place as alleged by the informant and the real fact is that due to digging of "Dobha" in "Gochar", both the parties got involved in the scuffle. Since the said witnesses are independent witnesses and have falsified the manner of occurrence as explained by the informant in the F.I.R., the petitioner may be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

**4.** Learned A.P.P. while opposing the petitioner's prayer for

anticipatory bail, submits that earlier the petitioner's anticipatory bail application i.e., A.B.A. No. 4781 of 2024 has been rejected by this Court on merit vide order dated 18.07.2024 wherein the submission of learned A.P.P. has been duly considered, according to which several witnesses, namely, Sanjay Yadav, Vicky Kumar Yadav, Vijay Yadav and Manjhari Devi including the informant have supported the case of prosecution. Hence, the petitioner may not be given the privilege of anticipatory bail.

**5.** Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering that the petitioner has failed to make out any case for reconsideration of his anticipatory bail application, I am not inclined to enlarge him on anticipatory bail.

**6.** The present anticipatory bail application is accordingly rejected.

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

Ritesh/