IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND, RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 1480 of 2026
----

1. Md. Hibullah Khan @ Mohibullah Khan, aged about 48 years, son of Zafrullah Khan, resident of village Samsabad, PO and PS – Imamganj, District – Gaya, Bihar

2. Md. Sarik Ahmad @ Md. Sharique Ahmad @ Md. Sharique Ahmed, aged about 39 years, son of Md. Sanaurab, resident of village – Kuibar, PO and PS – Imamganj, District – Gaya Bihar

.... Petitioners

-- Versus --

The State of Jharkhand **.... Opposite Party**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :- Mr. Rajesh Kr. Singh, Advocate

For the State :- Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, Advocate

02/***09.04.2026*** Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Pratappur P.S. Case No.62 of 2023, for the alleged offences registered under Sections 379 of Indian Penal Code, Section 21 of Mines and Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957 and Rule 54 of Jharkhand Minor Mineral Concession Rules, 2004 pending in the Court of learned Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Chatra.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case alleging that the license was expired in spite of that crusher machine was being operated. He further submits that so far petitioner No.2 is

concerned that allegation is not against him and the name of petitioner No.2 has come only on suspicion.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that allegations are there of operating crusher plant in absence of license. He submits that the petitioner No.1 is having one criminal antecedent.

5. Considering that the petitioner No.1 is having one criminal antecedent and he is said to be earlier licensee of the said crusher plant and the allegations are made that in absence of license crusher plant was being operated and in that view of the matter I am not inclined to provide anticipatory bail to the petitioner No.1 namely Md. Hibullah Khan @ Mohibullah Khan. Hence, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner No.1 namely Md. Hibullah Khan @ Mohibullah Khan is hereby rejected.

6. So far petitioner No.2 is concerned, he is not having any criminal antecedent and it is also not clear from the FIR that what role has been played by the petitioner No.2 and in that view of the matter the petitioner No.2 namely Md. Sarik Ahmad @ Md. Sharique Ahmad @ Md. Sharique Ahmed is directed to surrender before the learned Court within two weeks and the learned Court shall release the petitioner No.2, above named, on such terms and conditions or the sureties as the learned Court may deem fit and proper.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated 09.04.2026
Sangam/