

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P (C) No. 2188 of 2026

Federation of Indian Mineral Industries, a company registered under the Companies Act, 1956 having its Registered Office at FIMI House, B-311, Okhla Industrial Area, Phase-I, P.O, P.S. & District New Delhi, Delhi 110020; represented through its General Secretary Pramod Kumar Tyagi, aged about 64 years, resident of 1103, 11th Floor, Skytech Magadh, P.O. Okhla Phase II, P.S. Okhla, Industrial Area, Vaishali, Sector 3, Vaishali I E Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, Uttar Pradesh 201010

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The Union of India, through its Secretary, Ministry of Law & Justice, 4th Floor, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road, P.O. & P.S. Central Secretariat, New Delhi 110001
2. The State of Jharkhand, through its Chief Secretary, Project Bhawan, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, Town and District Ranchi;
3. The Principal Secretary, Department of Law, Project Bhawan, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, Town and District Ranchi
4. The Secretary, Department of Mines & Geology, Project Bhawan, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, Town and District Ranchi
5. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration & Land Reforms, Project Bhawan, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagarnathpur, Town and District Ranchi

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

For the Petitioner:	Mr Indrajit Sinah, Advocate (through V.C)
	Mr Amitabh Prasad, Advocate
For the Resp.-State:	Mr Piyush Chitresh, A.C to A.G
For the Resp.-UoI:	Mr Prashant Kumar Singh, Advocate

02/Dated: 04.05.2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. Leave is granted to replace Annexure-3, which is the Hindi version of the impugned Act. This is because the copy annexed as Annexure-3 contains several pages which are illegible. It should be done within ten days from today.
3. We issue rule in this petition.

4. Issue notice to the learned Advocate General. Mr Piyush Chitresh, learned A.C to A.G accepts notice on behalf of the learned Advocate General as also Respondents 2 to 5.
5. Mr Prashant Kumar Singh, learned DSGI appears on behalf of the 1st respondent.
6. Mr Sinha, at the outset very fairly, does not press for interim reliefs except that we clarify that any payments made by the petitioner and its members pursuant to the impugned Act and Rules should be made subject to the further orders that would be passed in this petition.
7. In any event, this is a challenge to the State Act and Rules made thereunder. Unless a case of manifest arbitrariness is made out, there is no question of staying a legislation which ordinarily carries with it the presumption of constitutionality. Accordingly, no case is made out for grant of interim relief. However, we clarify that any payments that the petitioner and its members shall make in terms of the impugned Act and Rules under protest or without prejudice, shall abide by the outcome of this petition.

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

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

May, 04, 2026

Ranjeet/R.Kr./Cp.1