

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI

A.B.A. No. 2133 of 2026

1. Nand Kishor Mehta @ Nemdhari Mehta @ Nand Kishor Prasad Mehta, aged about 46 years, son of Babulal Mahto, resident of Village Hadari, PS and PO Ichak, District Hazaribagh, Jharkhand

2. Ashish Mehta @ Ashish Kumar Mehta, aged about 42 years, son of late Chandra Kishor Mehta @ Chandra Kishor Prasad Mehta, resident of Village Chapra, PS and PO Ichak, District Hazaribagh, Jharkhand

*.... Petitioner**-- Versus --*

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :- Md Shadab Ansari, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Prabir Kumar Chatterjee, Advocate

2/06.05.2026 Heard learned counsels for petitioners and for State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Ichak PS Case No.174 of 2015, for offence registered under section 379 of IPC, Rules 48 and 54 of Jharkhand Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2004 and Rules, 3,6 and 8 of Jharkhand Minerals (Prohibition of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2017 and Section 21 of Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957, pending in court of learned J.M.F.C. Hazaribagh.

3. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case and the petitioners have nothing to do with the allegation of illegally running the stone

crusher in question. He next submits that the petitioners have got no criminal antecedent as disclosed in paragraph no.11 of the petition.

4. Learned State counsel opposes prayer and submits that allegations are there and the petitioners are running stone crusher illegally in absence of any valid document. He submits that in the order of the learned Sessions Judge it has come that the petitioner is having criminal antecedent of similar nature which has come in paragraph no.40 and 93 of the case-diary, and in that view of the matter, anticipatory bail may kindly rejected.

5. Considering that the petitioners have concealed the fact of criminal antecedent and it has been stated in paragraph no.11 that the petitioners have got no criminal antecedent and further the allegations are there of running crusher in absence of any valid document, and in the attending facts and circumstances of the instant case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, and as such, prayer for anticipatory bail to the petitioners is, hereby, rejected and consequently, this anticipatory bail application being A.B.A. No.2133 of 2026 is, hereby, dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

06.05.2026
SI/,