

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3697 of 2026

Sagar Kumar @ Sagar Mahto, aged about 52 years, son of Mahesh Mahto,
resident of 143, H.B. Road, near Durga Mandir, near B.I.T. More, Kedal,
P.O. and P.S. Sadar, District Bokaro, Jharkhand

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Nilendu Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P.
For the Informant : Ms. Sonali Bhattacharya, Advocate

02/ 11.08.2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for
the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with
Sadar P.S. Case No. 450 of 2025, registered for the offence under Sections
316(2), 318(2), 319(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2), 61(2) and 3(5) of Bhartiya
Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the court of learned Judicial Magistrate IV,
Ranchi.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and the petitioner is the
power of attorney holder and through the same power of attorney, the
petitioner has sold the land to the other person and the person who has
purchased the land, has been granted anticipatory bail by this court. He
next submits that Shailendra Kumar Rai has executed the power of attorney
in favour of the petitioner. On these grounds, he submits that anticipatory
bail may kindly be granted.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposes the prayer and
submits that serious allegations are there against the petitioner of cheating
and in view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the informant submits that the
petitioner has taken the power of attorney from Shailendra Kumar Rai and
even knowing the said land is of HUDCO and the informant has paid a sum

of Rs.01,32,48,000/- and when this fact has come to the knowledge of the informant, the informant has instituted a suit for cancellation of the sale deed which is pending. She submits that intention to cheat from the very beginning is made out.

6. It transpires that the petitioner has sold the land on the power of attorney which has been executed by Shailendra Kumar Rai and the land is of HUDCO and that land has been sold to the informant and the informant has already paid a sum of Rs.01,32,48,000/- for execution of the sale deed. Thus, selling the land of the HUDCO to the petitioner, clearly suggests that intention to cheat from the very beginning is there and further the petitioner is having three criminal antecedents however, in two of the cases, the petitioner has been acquitted and another criminal antecedent is there that has been stated in para 73 of the case diary, in the attending facts and circumstances, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner, is hereby, rejected.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 11.08.2026

Anit

Uploaded
11.08.2026