IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(PIL) No. 3676 of 2026

Anuranjan Ashok, S/o Ashok Kumar, R/o B-47, First Floor, Harmu Housing Colony, Ranchi ... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Mines and Geology, Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi
3. The Director, Department of Mines, Yojna Bhawan, Hinoo, Ranchi
4. The District Mining Officer, Giridih
5. The Director General, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Adre House, Ranchi
6. Sanjay Bagadia, S/o Mohan Lal Bagadia, R/o Power House Road, Barganda, Giridih

... … Respondents

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

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rajeev Kumar, Advocate
Mrs. Niteshwari Kumari, Advocate
For the Respondent-State : Mr. Vibhor Mayank, AC to AG

Order No. 02 **Dated: 18.06.2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner is a resident of Ranchi. He claims that illegal mining is occurring in the district of Giridih. He has not disclosed any connection to the district of Giridih or how he is concerned with the alleged illegal mining there.

3. There is nothing pleaded in this petition to indicate that the petitioner is otherwise involved in pointing out environmental or other violations. This petition is directed against a single person, i.e., the 6th respondent.

4. The allegations in the petition are vague. Reliance has been placed on a 2018 audit report, and the argument is that the observations in it have not been complied with to

date.

5. There are no averments in the petition to the effect that, for the period between 2018 and 2026, when this petition was instituted, the petitioner wrote to the authorities enquiring about the status of implementation or complaining of alleged non-compliance. Apart from a bare statement, there are no proper pleadings concerning the alleged non-implementation.

6. The petition contains vague prayers, such as directions to the 4th respondent to act not only against the 6th respondent but also against a "senior politician" alleged to have rescued the 6th respondent in the recent past. Needless to add that this so-called senior politician has not even been impleaded as a respondent in this petition.

7. Considering the above circumstances, we are not at all satisfied with the credentials of this petitioner. In fact, we suspect that this is not a genuine Public Interest Litigation but rather a "Paise Income Litigation". The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in the case of **Ashok Kumar Pandey Vs. The State of West Bengal,** reported in **(2004) 3 SCC 349**, has also taken note of several instances where Public Interest Litigations are being abused for extortion, etc.

8. At one stage, we are considering whether to issue directions to the respondents to at least look into the matter. However, we now realise that even such innocuous

orders sometimes operate as a source of revenue for unscrupulous petitioners.

9. Considering all the above circumstances, we do not think that this petition can be entertained.

10. Accordingly, we dismiss this petition without imposing any costs on the petitioner.

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

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

June 18, 2026
Manish/Ritesh

Uploaded on 20.06.2026