

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
L.P.A. No. 41 of 2026

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Principal Secretary,
Department of Higher and Technical Education, Yojna Bhawan
(Nepal House), Ranchi
 2. Jharkhand University of Technology (JUT), through its Registrar,
Science & Technology Campus, Namkum, Ranchi
- Appellants

Versus

1. Dhanbad Institute of Technology, Dhanbad, through its Principal-
cum-Director
 2. All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), through its
Chairman, New Delhi
 3. Union of India, through the Director, Central Bureau of
Investigation, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi
- Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Appellants	: Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Advocate General Mr. Ashutosh Anand, AAG-III Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondent No. 1	: Mr. Rajveer Singh, Advocate Mr. Niket Kumar Gupta, Advocate
For the Respondent No. 2	: Mr. Ratnesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent No. 3	: Mr. Prashant Pallav, A.S.G.I Mr. Deepak Kumar Bharati, Advocate

Order No. 02

Dated: 22.01.2026

Heard Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, learned Advocate General for the appellants, Mr. Rajveer Singh for the 1st respondent [original petitioner in W.P.(C) No. 95 of 2026], Mr. Ratnesh Kumar, learned counsel for the respondent – AICTE (2nd respondent) and Mr. Prashant Pallav, learned Additional Solicitor General of India for the respondent – Union of India (3rd respondent) along with Special Public Prosecutor Shri Deepak Bharati.

2. This appeal challenges order dated 13.01.2026 made by the learned Single Judge on the very first day when the matter was listed for effective hearing, ordering the impleadment of the Union of India through the Director, Central Bureau of Investigation

(CBI) as the 4th respondent and further, directing the C.B.I to investigate and submit its report in a sealed cover within two weeks on the aspects set out in paragraph no. 10 of the impugned order.

3. Paragraph no. 10 of the impugned order reads as follows:

"10. The Central Bureau of Investigation is directed to make investigation to the effect that:-

I. How the students have been trapped by the All India Council For Technical Education (AICTE) and the Jharkhand University of Technology (JUT)? And

II. Who have played what role in the trapping of the students?"

4. The above order, which we find to be extremely drastic, was made without affording the respondents any opportunity to file their reply and place their versions on record. The matter was for the first time listed on the immediately preceding day, i.e. 12.01.2026, and was adjourned to 13.01.2026 with directions that the Registrar, Jharkhand University of Technology (JUT), Namkum, Ranchi, would remain personally present in the Court. On 13.01.2026, the impugned order was made by impleading the C.B.I. as the 4th respondent.

5. Today, Mr Rajveer Singh, learned counsel for the 1st respondent, complains that he has not been served with a copy of the appeal memo, and that any orders passed by this Court would amount to a denial of a fair opportunity. The appellant's complaint is not significantly different. In any event, we are not making any final order in the appeal today. A full opportunity would be provided

to the respondent.

6. The lack of opportunity apart, the impugned order, prima facie, has drastic consequences. Ordinarily, the courts do not rush to invite the C.B.I to investigate matters, unless there is material suggesting that investigations by the State authorities are incompetent or otherwise not feasible. The impugned order, at least prima facie, proceeds on the basis that even the AICTE, which is a Central Statutory Body, is involved in '*trapping students*'. Investigations have been directed to determine the persons who have played a role and further determine the scope of their role in '*trapping of the students*'.

7. Prima facie, we feel that such a drastic order, if at all necessary, should have awaited a response from all concerned, followed by an opportunity to place their versions before the Court.

8. The Learned Advocate General states that copies of the appeal memo, together with its annexures, will be furnished to the Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents during the day. The copies are now furnished to the learned counsel for the respondents.

9. We post this matter on 29.01.2026 since the learned counsel for the 1st respondent expresses urgency. However, until the next date, the impugned order and the directions contained therein shall remain stayed for the brief reasons discussed above.

10. Learned Additional Solicitor General of India states that a preliminary enquiry has been registered by the C.B.I. Now that we have stayed the impugned order, the C.B.I shall not

proceed in the matter till the next date.

11. Learned counsel for the 1st respondent states that a reply would be filed and served to the appellants before the next date.

12. I.A. No. 796 of 2026 and I.A. No. 900 of 2026 stand disposed of.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

January 22, 2026
Manish/Ritesh