

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

B.A. (Filing) No.7429 of 2026

Naveen Kedia **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand through the Anti-corruption Bureau (ACB)
... .. **Opposite Party**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Devashish Bharuka, Sr. Advocate
: Ms. Trisha Mittal, Advocate
: Ms. Aparna Sharma, Advocate
: Mr. Shilesh Poddar, Advocate
: Mr. Sourav Raj Sharma, Advocate
: Ms. Xenia Dhar, Advocate
For the Opp. Party : Mr. Ritesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
: Mr. Nillohit Choubey, Advocate

02/13.04.2026

I.A. No.5089 of 2026

The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that this interlocutory application has been filed for ignoring the defect in connection with defect nos.58 wherein typed copies/legible copies of page nos.45, 70, 72, 82, 83, 84, 118, 119, 123, 124 and 125 of the bail petition are required to be filed.

2. The learned counsel further submitted that the certified copies of the said documents which form part of the FIR are illegible and therefore the petitioner is unable to do the needful to remove the said defect. He submitted that if the case diary is called for in this case, the documents would certainly be available therein. He also submitted that the petitioner shall not rely upon the aforesaid documents contained on said pages. He further submitted that the petitioner is not a named accused in the FIR.

3. The learned counsel for the ACB has no objection with regard to the prayer for ignoring the said defects.

4. Considering the submissions, defect no.58 is ignored for the present.

5. Accordingly, I.A. No.5089 of 2026 is allowed.

6. **B.A. (Filing) No.7429 of 2026**

7. Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties on the merits of the case.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR and the company in which the petitioner is a director at present had supplied liquor only for the period from 11.05.2022 to 22.05.2022 and during this period, the petitioner was not the director of the company. The petitioner was a director of the company sometimes in the year 2010 and then he was again inducted as a director from 20.11.2024 to 05.03.2025. He submits that apart from statement of co-accused recorded during investigation, there is no material to connect the petitioner with the alleged offence.

9. The learned counsel further submits that the documents relating to the directorship of the petitioner have not been brought on record, to which, he undertakes to file a supplementary affidavit to substantiate this submission, which he may do so within a period of 3 days from today.

10. The learned counsel ACB is directed to file a counter affidavit in the present case particularly pointing out the materials which have been collected against the petitioner during investigation and meeting the aforesaid submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner. The criminal antecedent report be also produced.

11. The learned counsel for the ACB is also directed to submit the case diary to this Court at least two days prior to the next date of hearing.

12. The counter affidavit be filed and the case diary be produced latest by 28.04.2026.

13. Post this case on 30.04.2026.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: 13.04.2026

Saurav

Date of Uploading: 13.04.2026