(2026:JHHC:24496)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cr.M.P. No. 1859 of 2026

------

1. Sujata Srivastava, W/o Late Satyendra Kumar Srivastava @ Late Satyender Kumar, Aged 63 years, R/o 6th Cross Road, Reliable Residency, H.S.R., New Extension, Harlur Road, Bengalore, P.O. & P.S. –H.S.R. Layout.
2. Ayush Srivastava @ Ayush Gaurav, S/o Late Satyendra Kumar Srivastava, Aged 35 years, R/o 6th Cross Road, Reliable Residency, H.S.R., New Extension, Harlur Road, Bengalore, P.O. & P.S. –H.S.R. Layout.

.... …. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Shreya, aged about 32 years, W/o Ashish Gaurav, D/o Bibhuti Bhushan @ Bibhuti Bhushan Prasad, R/o Gulab Bhuwan, Opp. 162D, Road No. 4D, P.O. –Ashok Nagar, P.S. –Argora, District –Ranchi, State –Jharkhand.

.... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Rahul Anand, Advocate
For the State : Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Spl. P.P.
For the O.P. No.2 : None

Order No.03 Dated- 14.08.2026

Heard the parties.

This criminal miscellaneous petition has been filed at the instance of the petitioners for restoration of Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 to its original file.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 was dismissed for non-compliance of the conditional order of this Court dated 10.04.2026 whereby the petitioners were directed to pay cost of Rs.10,000/- to the opposite party no.2 through their counsel appearing in the record within two weeks. It is next submitted that the learned counsel for the petitioners that due to an inadvertent mistake and a miscommunication, the clerk of the counsel wrongly heard the compliance timeline as “4 weeks’ time” instead of “2 weeks’ time” as stipulated by the order dated 10.04.2026, resulting in dismissal

of the said Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025; for non-compliance of the said peremptory order. It is then submitted that the non-compliance of the conditional order dated 10.04.2026, passed in the said Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 was neither deliberate nor intentional. It is next submitted that the petitioners have very good grounds to agitate in the said Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 and unless Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 is restored to its original file, the petitioners will be highly prejudiced. It is also submitted that the petitioners have already deposited the cost of Rs.10,000/- through the learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 appearing in the record, the copy of which is annexed at page no.12 of the brief. Hence, it is submitted that Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 be restored to its original file.

Considering the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner, Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 is restored to its original file to the stage at which, it was before its dismissal.

List Cr.M.P. No.3070 of 2025 under the appropriate heading after a week before the appropriate Bench.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

14.08.2026
Sonu-