

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**Cr. M.P No.1100 of 2026**

Baljeet Singh Bedi, aged about 64 years, son of Swarn Singh, resident of village Marar, Near Yash Tower, Post Ramgarh, Police Station Ramgarh, District Ramgarh. Petitioner

Versus

1.The State of Jharkhand

2.Kuldeep Singh, son of Late Yashwant Singh, resident of village Jaridih Bazar, Post Jaridih Bazar, Police Station Bermo, District Bokaro Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY PRASAD

For the Petitioner : Mr. Samavesh Bhanj Deo, Advocate
 For the State : Mr. Shiv Shankar Kumar, APP
 For the O.P No.2 : Mr. Rajesh Kumar Mahatha, Advocate

06/Dated: 19th August, 2026

Heard Mr. Samavesh Bhanj Deo, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rajesh Kumar Mahatha, learned counsel for the O.P. No.2.

2. This Cr.M.P No.1100 of 2026 has been filed on behalf of the petitioner for restoration of Cr. Revision No.746 of 2020 which stood dismissed on account of non-removal of defects in pursuance to the order dated 01.05.2023 passed by this Court.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that peremptory order dated 01.05.2023 could not be complied with due to inadvertence on the part of the petitioner and also due to the fact that the previous counsel could not heard the observation of this Court. It is submitted that now the petitioner has prepared the Demand Draft of Rs.4,00,000/ (Rs.Four Lakhs), i.e., Rs.3,00,000/ (Rs.Three Lakhs) dated 12.06.2026 and Rs.1,00,000/ (Rs.One Lakh) dated 01.07.2026 in compliance of the order dated 27.03.2023 and hence the Cr. Revision No.746 of 2020 may be restored.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further produced the photo copy of the said Demand Drafts, let it be kept on record.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the O.P. No.2 raised no objection and submitted that he may be handed over the said Demand Draft of Rs.4,00,000/- (Rs.Four Lakhs).

6. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and from going through the records of this case, it appears that vide order dated 27.03.2023 the petitioner was directed to deposit Demand Draft of Rs.4,00,000 (Rs.Four Lakhs) in the office of the learned Registrar General, however, the said Demand Draft could not be deposited within time and Cr. Revision No.746 of 2020 stood dismissed on account of non-removal of defects due to peremptory order dated 01.05.2023 passed by this Court

7. During Course of argument, learned counsel for the petitioner produced the original Demand Draft as well as the photo copy of the Demand Draft of Rs.3,00,000/ (Rs.Three Lakhs) dated 12.06.2026 and Rs.1,00,000/ (Rs.One Lakh) dated 01.07.2026.

8. Under the circumstances, the Cr. Revision No.746 of 2020 is restored, subject to the condition that the petitioner shall deposit the said Demand Draft of Rs.3,00,000/ (Rs.Three Lakhs) dated 12.06.2026 and Rs.1,00,000/ (Rs.One Lakh) dated 01.07.2026 in the office of the learned Registrar General within ten (10) days.

9. Thus, Cr.M.P. No. 1100 of 2026 is allowed and Cr. Revision No.746 of 2020 is restored to its original file.

10. Learned counsel for the O.P. No.2 is given liberty to move before the appropriate Bench for redressal of his grievances.

(Sanjay Prasad, J.)

Dated: 19.08.2026
Saket/-