

News

The Jharkhand High Court mandates training for a magistrate who disregarded the bail criteria set down by the Supreme Court.



The Hazaribagh Magistrate was chastised by the court for directing the arrest of a 66-year-old man in spite of previous cognizance.

In spite of Supreme Court decisions that shield an accused person from arrest once cognizance is taken, the Jharkhand High Court harshly criticized a Judicial Magistrate in Hazaribagh on June 11 for remanding a 66-year-old man to custody in a complaint case [**Ruplal Rana v. State of Jharkhand**].

Justice Ananda Sen's bench noted that the magistrate had not adhered to the Supreme Court's binding rulings, specifically in *Satender Kumar Antil v. CBI*, which established precise guidelines for calling defendants in complaint cases when cognisance has already been

granted.

The High Court declared, "*This is unfortunate and unwarranted*," after observing that the Magistrate's actions demonstrated a lack of knowledge of fundamental bail law and personal liberty protections, despite having substantial judicial training.

Four Hazaribagh district residents submitted the anticipatory bail plea in relation to a complaint case that involved allegations under various IPC sections, including Sections 420 (cheating), 467 (forgery), 468 (forgery for cheating), 452 (trespass), and 120B (conspiracy). By ordering the petitioners to appear before the Magistrate, who would subsequently handle their case in line with the law, the Court had already resolved the application in April 2025.

However, once it was revealed that petitioner Ruplal Rana had appeared before the Magistrate but had been remanded to custody despite citing the Satender Kumar Antil verdict, the case was brought up once more before the High Court on June 11.

His attorney argued that other petitioners had not shown up out of fear of being arrested and that the magistrate had denied bail.

The High Court pointed out that arrest is not always the result of a complaint case moving forward to cognizance and summons being issued, citing a number of binding precedents from the highest court. Bail without detention will be considered after the accused is summoned.

Citing paragraph 3 of the 2021 ruling in Satender Kumar Antil, the Court noted that "*bail applications of such accused on appearance may be decided without the accused being taken in physical custody or by granting interim bail till the bail application is decided*."

The Magistrate operated in total violation of these established standards, according to Justice Sen.

These are the situations in which a citizen's personal freedom is at risk. The magistrate must be well-informed on these kinds of matters, particularly those pertaining to rulings that deal with individual liberty. Unfortunately, notwithstanding the actions done by the Jharkhand Judicial Academy, no results have been obtained. Despite awareness campaigns, magistrates continue to issue these kinds of rulings without using their judgment or the law. "This is regrettable and unjustified," the High Court wrote in the ruling.

It mandated that a copy of the order be faxed right away to the Jharkhand Judicial Academy Director, the Principal District Judge, and the concerned Judicial Magistrate.

The decree stated, "*The Director shall provide this specific Judicial Magistrate with extensive online training for at least two days after court hours and educate the Magistrate on the rulings of the Honorable Supreme Court.*"

Advocate Randhir Kumar represented the petitioners.

Additional Public Prosecutor Pankaj Kumar Mishra represented the State.

Lawread