IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 7285 of 2025

Arun Pati Tripathi, aged about 57 years, son of P.P. Tripathi, resident of Qr. No. 1A, Street No.SPA, Sector – 9, Bhilai, P.O. Bhilai, P.S. Sector – 6, Bhilai, District Durg, Chhattisgarh.

… … Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand through Anti-corruption Bureau

… … Opposite Party

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Shishir Prakash, Advocate
M/s Karuna Krishan Tharya
[Both through V.C.]
: Mr. Bibhash Sinha, Advocate
: Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate

For the Opp. Party : Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate
: Mr. Ritesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
: Mr. Nillohit Choubey, Advocate
: Ms. Shruti Shekhar, Advocate
: Ms. Sanya Kumari, Advocate

CAV on: 16.04.2026 **Pronounced on 24.04.2026**

This anticipatory bail application has been filed by the petitioner who is apprehending arrest in connection with ACB P.S. Case No. 09/2025 for the offence registered under Sections 61(2) read with Sections 318, 336, 340, 316/45 and 49 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 7(c), 12, 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(a) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 said to be pending in the court of learned Special Judge, Vigilance, ACB, Ranchi.

2. Arguments of the Petitioner

A. All the main accused and beneficiaries of this case have either been granted bail or default bail or anticipatory bail. So far as the petitioner is concerned, he is not a named accused and he is the Managing Director of ***Chhattisgarh State Marketing Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as CSMCL)***. CSMCL being a Government Organization, the opposite party could not have proceeded in absence of sanction in terms of Section 17A of the ***Prevention of Corruption Act (hereinafter referred to as the P.C. Act)*** as amended.

B. In Chhattisgarh, there was substantial collection of State Excise

Revenue and therefore, the State of Jharkhand also started consulting the State of Chhattisgarh, so that a similar model or module could be adopted in the State of Jharkhand as well. In terms of negotiation between the State of Chhattisgarh and State of Jharkhand, it was agreed that CSMCL would be an advisor to ***Jharkhand State Beverages Corporation Limited (hereinafter referred to as JSBCL)*** in the State of Jharkhand, so that the excise revenue can be increased in the State of Jharkhand as well.

C. The State of Chhattisgarh and the State of Jharkhand are independent state and are competent to take independent policy decision and both the States have acted as per their policy and ultimately by virtue of policy decision of the State of Jharkhand, CSMCL became an advisor to JSBCL. Since the petitioner was the Managing Director of the CSMCL, he had a role to play in the advisory capacity to the JSBCL.

D. The arrangement between the two states was penned down in the form of an agreement which was akin to a policy decision and CSMCL continued to be the advisor of JSBCL for a period from 04.02.2022 till 13.03.2022. As per the terms and conditions itself, the CSMCL is not to be responsible for consequence any of its advice in the capacity of advisor.

E. So far as the FIR is concerned, it starts with an allegation that the bank guarantees, which were furnished in connection with manpower agencies, were found to be fake and so far as the petitioner is concerned, it is alleged that the petitioner had paid Rs. Five Crore to Vinay Kumar Choubey, the secretary, excise department of the State of Jharkhand, to be appointed as advisor.

F. Once the petitioner was the Managing Director of the CSMCL, he had no option, but to act as Managing Director of CSMCL and there was no occasion for the petitioner to participate in the policy making of the Chhattisgarh State or Jharkhand State.

G. All the decisions have been taken by the State of Jharkhand and their authorities and the entire transaction relating to the liquor policy and consequential decisions are exclusively within the domain of State of Jharkhand. The petitioner has no role to pay at all and ex-facie no case is made out against the petitioner. The petitioner is not at all connected with the State of Jharkhand.

3. While explaining the reason for not appearing before the investigating authority in the present case pursuant to notice issued

under Section 35(3) of BNSS, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted as under: -

i. Similar FIR was lodged against the petitioner in Chhattisgarh State and he was arrested and ultimately the matter reached the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the petitioner was directed to be released on bail in terms of the order passed in Cri. Appeal No. 1263/2025. He submits that as per the conditions of bail, the petitioner was required to report before the Investigation Officer of the case every day at 10:00 a.m. commencing from 10th April 2025.

ii. The learned counsel has submitted that right from 10th April 2025, the petitioner is abiding the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court and is appearing before the investigating agency in Chhattisgarh every day without any fault. The learned counsel submits that once he is under the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court to appear before the authority at Chhattisgarh every day at 10:00 a.m., it was impossible for him to abide by the notice issued by the State of Jharkhand under Section 35(3) of BNSS.

iii. In the present case, the notice was issued under Section 35(3) of BNSS through e-mail, which is not as per the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in the case of Satyendra Kumar Antil vs. CBI and other cases. He has further submitted that the e-mail was responded by the petitioner through counsel stating that it was not possible for the petitioner to participate in the investigation conducted by the authority at Jharkhand as he was under a legal obligation to appear before the authorities at Chhattisgarh pursuant to the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The learned counsel submits that on account of such a situation, the petitioner is unable to leave the State of Chhattisgarh even for one day.

iv. He submits that it was for the opposite party herein to approach the Hon'ble Supreme Court for appropriate orders, so that the petitioner may participate in the investigation in the State of Jharkhand.

4. However, the fact that the petitioner has been appearing pursuant to the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court from 10th April 2025 on each and every day is not on record. To which, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he can still produce appropriate material to substantiate this aspect of the matter.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner has also submitted that the authority at Chhattisgarh has not filed charge-sheet against the petitioner till date. He has also submitted that Binay Kumar Singh, who is the owner of Mahindra Nexgen Showroom, Ranchi and who is alleged to have good relationship with Vinay Kumar Choubey, has been granted anticipatory bail by the learned district court, but the order of anticipatory bail is not available with him.

6. **<u>Arguments of the Opposite Party - ACB</u>**

(a) Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite party-ACB has opposed the prayer and has submitted that there was a sea-change in the policy with respect to retail liquor vend. Earlier the retail liquor license was to be given to individual persons and JSBCL was primarily the coordinating authority. However, by virtue of change in the policy, JSBCL became the whole sole authority so far as the retail liquor vend is concerned, inasmuch as, they owned the liquor shops and they simply appointed manpower agencies to operate the liquor shop.

(b) The learned counsel further submits that all the placement agencies, which were working at Chhattisgarh, were also appointed for the purposes taking up the job of placement agencies in the State of Jharkhand as well. He submits that the ***modus-operandi,*** which was adopted in the State of Chhattisgarh, was also extended to the State of Jharkhand, in which the petitioner and three other co-accused persons, namely, Anwar Dhebar, Arbind Singh and Vikash Agrawal have played major role.

(c) He submits that in the month of January 2022, Rs. Five Crore was handed over to Vinay Kumar Choubey who was the Secretary of the Excise Department of the State of Jharkhand and that money was handed over by the Arun Pati Tripathi, the present petitioner, along with Anwar Dhebhar who visited the residence of Vinay Kumar Choubey at Ranchi along with one Vidhu Gupta. The learned counsel submits that following persons have got their statement recorded under section 183 B.N.S.S :-

i. *Case Diary No. 27 Navendu Shekhar*
ii. *Case Diary No. 56 Vidhu Gupta*
iii. *Case Diary No. 49 Amit Mittal*
iv. *Case Diary No. 55 Sanjeev Jain*

(d) The learned counsel for the A.C.B. has produced the statement of

Navendu Shekhar, Vidhu Gupta, Amit Mittal and Sanjeev Jain all recorded under Section 183 BNSS and by referring to the same, he has submitted that the entire modus-operandi with respect to the involvement of the petitioner has been narrated by each one of them. He has submitted that the statement recorded under Section 183 of Cr.P.C. certainly has great relevance and therefore the petitioner is required for custodial interrogation.

(e) The learned counsel has also submitted that the statement under Sections 161 of Cr.P.C. [equivalent to Section 180 of BNSS] may not have much value, but the statement under Section 164 of Cr.P.C. [equivalent to Section 183 of BNSS] has certain evidentiary value, which in the present case connects the petitioner with the alleged offence.

(f) The learned counsel submits that it's a case of deep-rooted conspiracy and therefore custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. The petitioner is required to be confronted with the other co-accused persons during the course of interrogation and therefore the petitioner is not entitled for anticipatory bail.

(g) The learned counsel has further submitted that the inability of the petitioner to appear before the authority in Jharkhand does not reflect from his statement made in the anticipatory bail application. Further, the learned counsel has referred to paragraph 16 of the anticipatory bail application to submit that the only excuse for not appearing before the authority in Jharkhand was that in absence of any sanction for prosecution under Section 17A of P.C. Act, he was not required to appear. In paragraph-16, a reply was said to have been sent with respect to the aforesaid stand of the petitioner.

(h) The learned counsel has further referred to Section 197 of Cr.P.C. as it stood earlier dealing with required sanction for prosecution and Section 17A of P.C. Act as amended with effect from 26.07.2018 and has submitted that the terminology used therein are different. Section 197 of Cr.P.C. is much wider in purport as compared to Section 17A of P.C. Act. He has submitted that under Section 197 of Cr.P.C., the terminology used is *"while acting or purporting to act in the discharge of his official duty"* and in Section 17A of P.C. Act, the terminology used is *"where the alleged offence is relatable to any recommendation made or decision taken by such public servant in discharge of his official functions or duties"*.

(i) The learned counsel has referred to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***(2015) 13 SCC 87 [Inspector of Police & Anr. vs. Battenapatla Venkata Ratnam & Anr.],*** paragraph 7, 9 and 10 and has submitted that any act of taking or giving bribe, as involved in the present case, does not require any prosecution sanction. However, in the counter-affidavit, a statement has been made that the A.C.B. has taken steps for getting sanction for prosecution by way of abundant precaution.

7. <u>Rejoinder of the petitioner.</u>

The learned counsel for the petitioner, in rejoinder, referred to the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in ***(2020) 2 SCC 338 [Yashwant Sinha & Anr. vs. CBI & Anr.],*** paragraph 117 and submitted that without prior sanction, there can be neither any inquiry nor any enquiry nor any investigation against a public servant. The learned counsel has submitted that the entire action of the opposite party is vitiated on account of want of sanction under Section 17A of P.C. Act.

8. ***After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the materials placed on record, this court finds*** that the case of the prosecution, as per the written complaint of Vinay Kumar Ram, the Investigating officer ACB, Ranchi, which forms the basis of FIR, is that in July 2023 Jharkhand State Beverages Corporation Limited (JSBCL) engaged two placement agencies for the supply of manpower at its retail liquor stores. It has been alleged that the said placement agencies: (i) M/s Vision Hospitality Services & Consultants Pvt. Ltd, and (ii) M/s Marshan Innovative Security Services Pvt. Ltd., submitted bank guarantees to JSBCL. Subsequently, on account of some violations on their part, the said bank guarantees were sought to be encashed, then it was revealed that those bank guarantees were fake. Hence, FIR was filed against 13 accused persons which also included Mr Vinay Kumar Choubey, who was posted as Principal Secretary of Excise and Prohibition Department, Government of Jharkhand at the relevant point of time along with other officials of Excise Department and also the private placement agencies who had provided fake bank guarantees at the time of submission of documents

to JSBCL.

9. After institution of FIR, during the course of investigation and on the basis of the evidences collected, it was revealed that the ***petitioner Arun Pati Tripathi*** had close links with the FIR named accused and the main accused Vinay Kumar Choubey, Principal Secretary of Excise and Prohibition Department, Government of Jharkhand and the petitioner was found to be the key conspirator in commission of the alleged offences causing great financial loss to the State of Jharkhand. It also transpired that in the month of January 2022, Rs.5,00,00,000 (five crore) was handed over to said Vinay Kumar Choubey and that money was handed over by the ***Arun Pati Tripathi, the present petitioner, along with Anwar Dhebhar who visited the residence of Vinay Kumar Choubey at Ranchi along with one Vidhu Gupta.***

10. The opposite party has stated that the statements of following persons have been recorded under section 183 B.N.S.S:-

a. Case Diary No. 27 Navendu Shekhar
b. Case Diary No. 56 Vidhu Gupta
c. Case Diary No. 49 Amit Mittal
d. Case Diary No. 55 Sanjeev Jain

The learned counsel for the A.C.B. has produced the statements of Navendu Shekhar, Vidhu Gupta, Amit Mittal and Sanjeev Jain, all recorded under Section 183 BNSS during the course of hearing and for purposes of fairness, the learned counsel for the petitioner also had the occasion to have a look at those statements.

11. The opposite party has referred to the counter affidavit to highlight the evidences that surfaced during the investigation, wherein it has been stated as under: -

I. One Amit Mittal in his statement recorded under Section 180 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 161 of Cr.P.C) has stated that Arun Pati Tripathi was Managing Director of CSMCL and during the work in the State of Chhattisgarh, he met the Petitioner. Thereafter the Petitioner was appointed as advisor in JSBCL. Further the said witness stated that the Petitioner along with one Anwar Dhebar paid a sum of Rs.5 crores to Vinay Kumar Choubey as bribe, so that the Petitioner becomes advisor in

JSBCL. The said fact is recorded at paragraph 491 of CD.

II. Statement of one Siddharth Singhania was recorded under Section 180 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 161 of Cr.P.C) and it was revealed that the Petitioner was appointed as advisor in JSBCL. The said fact is recorded at Para 413 of CD.

III. Statement of Gajendra Singh has also been recorded under 180 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 161 of Cr.P.C), and, it was revealed that the Petitioner being the Managing Director of CSMCL along with one Janardhan Singh (who most probably was Inspector in the Excise Department of Chhattisgarh) used to come and meet the then Secretary namely Vinay Kumar Choubey, and, due to good relations with Vinay Kumar Choubey, Petitioner used to bully the officials of JSBCL. The said fact is recorded at Para 134 of CD.

IV. One Sanjeev Jain, Rajeev Dwivedi, Manish Jain (all directors of Prima One Work Force Private Limited) were recorded under Section 180 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 161 of Cr.P.C) and, it has been stated that during talks with Shiddharth Singhania, it was informed that Vidhu Gupta, Arun Pati Tripathi (Petitioner herein) and Anwar Dhebar met Vinay Kumar Choubey at officials residence, where the Petitioner and Anwar Dhebar handed over bag to Vinay Kumar Choubey which contained money around 5 to 6 crores. The said fact is recorded para 521 of CD.

V. Statement of one Non-F.I.R accused namely Vidhu Gupta was recorded under Section 180 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 161 of Cr.P.C) and the said witness stated that in the year 2022, he came to Ranchi and Anwar Dhebar along with Arun Pati Tripathi also came to Ranchi by road from Chhattisgarh, and the said persons took the witness to meet Vinay Kumar Choubey at his official residence. Further, the said witness also revealed that even discussions were done in respect of the liquor policy and thereafter Anwar Dhebar and Arun Pati Tripathi took out 4-5 bags from their car which contained Rs.5 crores and the same was handed over to Vinay Kumar Choubey and the said person willingly accepted the said amount. Further the said witness also stated that Vinay Kumar Choubey told that now onwards the entire things would be looked after by Binay Kumar Singh who owns Mahindra Nexgen showroom at Ranchi, and, good relationship developed between the aforementioned persons, and, when the work of supply of liquor was started, thereafter, on

interval of 15 days or a month, Anwar Dhebar used to send money to Vinay Kumar Singh. The said fact is recorded at para 506 of CD.

VI. Navendu Shekher (F.I.R. named accused) in his statement recorded under Section 183 of BNSS (corresponding of Section 164 of Cr.P.C.), on 17.06.2025 has stated that Vinay Kumar Choubey, Arun Pati Tripathi and Siddharth Singhania were the master mind of entire liquor tender and the said persons got the tender conditions altered so that commission of Placement Agencies became higher and loss was caused to Government.

VII. Even statement of one Non-F.I.R. accused has also been recorded us 183 of BNSS on 25.07.2025 and in his statement, it has also been stated that Arun Pati Tripathi along with one Anwar Dhebar handed over 4 to 5 bags containing money amounting to Rs. 5 crores to Vinay Kumar Choubey at his official residence as "Shagun" and Vinay Kumar Chaubey happily and willingly accepted the same.

VIII. Further even statement of another witness has been recorded under Section 183 of BNSS on 16.07.2025, and even the said witness has disclosed the role of the petitioner in the entire liquor scam and has further stated that amount of Rs. 5 crores were already handed over to Vinay Kumar Choubey at his residence and the deal has been finalized.

12. Statement of several other witnesses has been recorded under Section 183 of BNSS on 24.07.2025 and in which the role, participation and involvement of the Petitioner in the entire liquor scam has been duly surfaced and revealed by the said witness.

13. ***With regard to non-cooperation of the petitioner in the investigation of the present case***, it has been specifically stated by the opposite party in the counter affidavit that even notice dated 01.08.2025, under Section 35(3) of BNSS was issued by the Investigating officer to the petitioner directing him to appear on 08.08.2025. However, the petitioner did not appear on the scheduled date and as such it would be evident that the petitioner is not cooperating in investigation of the instant case.

14. It is not in dispute that the petitioner is an accused for alleged offence punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120 B of

Indian Penal Code read with Sections 7 and 12 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 and his prayer for bail was rejected by the concerned court in the State of Chhattisgarh. The refusal of bail in the case at Chhattisgarh was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Criminal Appeal No.1263 of 2025 by the present petitioner and the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 07.03.2025 while enlarging the petitioner on bail imposed certain conditions and observed that the present petitioner will be enlarged on bail on 10.04.2025 subject to appropriate terms and conditions fixed by the concerned session court and apart from that the following conditions were directed to be incorporated:

(a) The appellant shall deposit his passport, if he is holding a passport, with the investigating officer.

(b) He shall report to the Investigating officer every day at 10 a.m; and

(c) Till the charge sheet is filed, he will continue to co-operate with the Investigating officer for investigation.

15. By referring to the said order of Hon'ble Supreme Court while granting bail to the petitioner, it has been submitted that the petitioner is bound to report to the Investigating officer of the case every day at 10 a.m., and therefore, he is unable to respond and participate in the investigation conducted by the opposite party in the present case instituted in the State of Jharkhand. Further, it has been submitted that in the absence of sanction under Section 17A of the P.C. Act, the entire investigation conducted by the State of Jharkhand in the present case is *void-ab-initio* and *non-est* in the eyes of law.

16. Both the aforesaid reasons cited for non-participation in the investigation in the present case are devoid of any merits as is apparent from the following discussions: -

A. ***Non-cooperation in investigation.*** It has been argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner had responded to the notice issued under Section 35 (3) of BNSS, informing the opposite party about his aforesaid difficulty in appearing in Jharkhand due to the directions of the Hon'ble

Supreme Court, and is therefore not in a position to cooperate with the investigation in the State of Jharkhand.

In anticipatory bail application, it has not been mentioned by the petitioner as to whether the interrogation of the petitioner by the Anti-corruption Bureau at Chhattisgarh has been completed and whether even after expiry of about one year from the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the petitioner is still required to appear before the investigating authority in Chhattisgarh on every day at 10.00 a.m.

Rather, it has further been submitted that it was for the State of Jharkhand to take steps before the Hon'ble Supreme Court for modification of the order with regard to conditions of bail imposed upon the petitioner to appear before the Investigating officer of the case at Chhattisgarh every day at 10.a.m. Such arguments are devoid of any merits.

The anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioner does not refer to any difficulty with respect to appearance of the petitioner before the State of Jharkhand pursuant to the notice under Section 35 (3) of the BNSS. Rather, the specific case of the petitioner is that for want of sanction, the authorities in the State of Jharkhand cannot proceed against the petitioner.

The plea taken by the petitioner for not appearing before the ACB, Ranchi, Jharkhand as argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner by referring to the order and conditions of bail imposed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court is not acceptable.

If the petitioner was facing any difficulty in complying with the notices issued by the opposite party under Section 35 (3) of the BNSS, it was for the petitioner to take appropriate steps. However, no such ground/difficultly has been mentioned in the anticipatory bail application or even in the rejoinder to the counter affidavit where the opposite party has alleged non-cooperation by the petitioner in investigation.

B. ***So far as the plea regarding absence of sanction under Section 17A of P.C. Act*** for proceeding against the petitioner is

concerned, this Court is of the considered view that the learned court, while rejecting the said plea, has rightly recorded that the requirement of sanction under Section 17A of Prevention of Corruption Act arises only when the act of the government servant constituting an offence relate to any recommendation made or decision taken by him in discharge of official functions or duties. The present case is not covered by the circumstances required for sanction under section 17A when seen in the light of the allegations made against the petitioner. In such circumstances, the judgement relied upon by the petitioner reported in ***(2020) 2 SCC 338 [Yashwant Sinha & Anr. vs. CBI & Anr.]*** does not help the petitioner in any manner.

C. The learned court also recorded that the petitioner was not the member of any committee constituted by the Government of Chhattisgarh for submitting proposals regarding amendments in the Excise Policy, Acts or the Rules of Excise Department, Government of Jharkhand. Further, the petitioner neither made any recommendation nor took any decision officially for the State of Jharkhand in discharge of his official functions or duties. The allegation against the petitioner is of bribing the government officials of the State of Jharkhand for illegal gain to the accused persons and causing wrongful loss to the State exchequer. Hence, there was no requirement of prior sanction under Section 17A of Prevention of Corruption Act.

In the present case, the allegation against the petitioner is of bribing the higher officials of Government of Jharkhand, therefore, no prior approval or sanction is required to proceed against the petitioner. However, the opposite party has submitted that by way of abundant precaution, they have applied for sanction against the petitioner under Section 17A of the Prevention of Corruption Act.

17. This Court finds that there are direct allegations against the petitioner that the petitioner along with two co-accused paid Rs.5 Crores to Binay Kumar Choubey as bribe in the month of January

2022 at the residence of Binay Kumar Choubey, then Secretary of the Excise Department of the State of Jharkhand.

18. This Court is of the view that there is direct and serious allegation against the petitioner and incriminating materials have been collected during investigation on the record show that the petitioner is involved in conspiracy in the liquor scam involved in the State of Jharkhand. This Court is of the considered view that the statement of witness/co-accused as recorded under Section 183 BNSS (corresponding to Section 164 Cr.P.C) stand on much higher pedestal as those recorded under Section 180 BNSS (corresponding to Section 161 Cr.P.C) and custodial interrogation of the petitioner would be necessary so as to confront the petitioner with the statement of the co-accused/witnesses during investigation to come to the truth of the matter.

19. This Court finds that on account of complete non-cooperation from the side of the petitioner and non-participation in the matter of investigation, the investigation in the State of Jharkhand in connection with the liquor scam has not proceeded with respect to the allegation made against the petitioner and also the corresponding allegation made against Vinay Kumar Choubey. It has been submitted by the petitioner that Vinay Kumar Choubey has been enlarged on default bail in the matter.

20. The details of the anticipatory bail applications of the co-accused have been mentioned as under:

Name	**Case no.**	**Result**
Thakor Paresh @ Paresh Abhesing Thakor @ Paresh Thakur	A.B.A. No.4597 of 2025 (dated: 14.10.2025)	Dismissed as infructuous.
Thakor Vikramsing @ Vikramsingh Abhesingh Thakor @ Thakor Vikremsing	A.B.A. No.4595 of 2025 (dated 14.10.2025)	Dismissed as infructuous
Jagan Tukaram Desai	ABA No.4954 of 2025 (dated: 10.12.2025)	Rejected
Kamal Jagan Desai	ABA No.4949 of 2025 (Dated: 10.12.2025)	Rejected

Sheetal Jagan Desai	ABA. No.4930 of 2025 (Dated: 10.12.2025)	Rejected
Sudhir Kumar Das (Regular bail)	B.A. No.8077 of 2025 (dated 17.09.2025)	Dismissed as withdrawn
Asheesh Saurabh Kedia	ABA No.5390 of 2025 (dated: 13.11.2025)	Rejected
Paramar Bipinbhai @ Bipin Jadavbhai Parmar @ Parmar Bipin Jadav Bhai	A.B.A. No.4596 of 2025 (dated: 10.11.2025)	Rejected
Mahesh Shedge @ Mahesh Sitaram Shedge @ Mahesh S Shedge	A.B.A. No.4604 of 2025 (dated 14.10.2025)	Dismissed as infructuous
Shyam Jee Sharan @ Shyam Sharan	ABA No.6244 of 2025 (dated: 04.02.2026)	Rejected
Md. Tabarak (Regular Bail)	B.A. No.11166 of 2025 (dated 04.12.2025)	Bail granted
Deepak Kumar @ Dipak Kumar (Regular Bail)	B.A. No.11220 of 2025 (dated 04.12.2025)	Bail granted
Arun Lal (Regular Bail)	B.A. No.11219 of 2025 (dated: 04.12.2025)	Bail granted
Naresh Kumar (Regular bail)	B.A. No.11221 of 2025 (dated 04.12.2025)	Bail granted
Md. Israil Ansari @ Md. Israel Ansari (Regular bail)	B.A. No.11165 of 2025 (dated 04.12.2025)	Bail granted

The records of the case further reveals that the anticipatory bail applications of two accused namely Kamal Jagan Desai and Sheetal Jagan Desai, were rejected by this Court in A.B.A. No. 4949 of 2025 and A.B.A. No.4930 of 2025 vide orders dated 10.12.2025 respectively. Notice has been issued in the case of the aforesaid two co-accused by the Hon'ble Supreme Court with an interim order directing that no coercive steps shall be taken till the next date of hearing subject to those petitioners co-operating with the investigation.

It has also been placed on record that a co-accused namely Binay Kumar Singh, has been granted anticipatory bail by the learned Special Judge Anti-corruption Bureau, Ranchi in ABP No.1631 of

2025 vide order dated 07.07.2025 by recording that the case was at the stage of investigation as on the date of the order i.e. 07.07.2025 and at that stage no direct and specific evidence and materials appeared to be available against Binay Kumar Singh and anticipatory bail was granted subject to the conditions mentioned therein.

21. This Court finds that the grant of anticipatory bail to Binay Kumar Singh by the learned trial court does not help the petitioner in any manner in view of the fact that the materials have been collected against the petitioner, but on account of complete non-cooperation from the side of the petitioner, the investigation is not proceeding against the petitioner and related co-accused including Binay Kumar Choubey, the then Principal Secretary of Excise and Prohibition Department, Government of Jharkhand.

22. As a result of the aforesaid discussions, the prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioner is rejected.

23. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the court concerned through FAX/email.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of pronouncement:24.04.2026
Saurav
Date of Uploading:24.04.2026