IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr.M.P. No. 1772 of 2026

---

1. Shailendra Kumar Keshri @ Pappu Prasad Keshri, S/o Late Govind Prasad Keshri (husband), aged about 30 years.
2. Amit Prasad Keshri, S/o Late Govind Prasad Keshri, aged about 28 years
3. Sanjay Prasad Keshri, S/o Late Govind Prasad Keshri (Bhainsur), aged about 36 years.
4. Ranjit Prasad Keshri, S/o late Govind Prasad Keshri, aged about 34 years.
5. Ashish Prasad Keshri, S/o Late Govind Prasad Keshri (Dewar), aged about 26 years.
6. Gayatri Devi, W/o Late Govind Prasad Keshri (Saas), aged about 58 years.
7. Sarita Devi, W/o Sanjay Prasad Keshri (Badi Gotni), aged about 34 years.
8. Soni Devi, W/o Ranjit Prasad Keshri @ Bablu (Middle Gotni), aged about 30 years

   All are Residents of Village –Sariya, P.O. Padma O.P., P.S. – Barhi, District –Hazaribagh, Presently residing at Government Quarter, Subhash Nagar, P.O. –Phusro, P.S. – Bermo, District –Bokaro.

.... …. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Poonam Kumari, Wife of Shailendra Kumar Keshri @ Pappu Prasad Keshri and daughter of Madan Prasad Keshri, Resident of Village –Danuwa, P.O. & P.S. –Chouparan, District –Hazaribagh. .... Opp. Parties

---

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Nitesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. P.D. Agrawal, Spl. P.P.
For the O.P. No.2 : Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate

Order No.04 Dated- 06.11.2026

Heard the parties.

This criminal miscellaneous petition has been filed at the instance of the petitioners for restoration of Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 to its original file.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 was dismissed for non-compliance of the conditional order of this Court dated 17.04.2026 whereby the

petitioners were directed to pay cost of Rs.5,000/- to the opposite party no.2 through their counsel appearing in the record within two weeks. It is next submitted that the counsel for the petitioner suffered a sudden health complication in his family; on account of which he remained unavailable for several days and the petitioners were not properly communicated about the requirement of payment of the cost within the stipulated period, resulting in dismissal of the said Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026. It is then submitted that the non-compliance of the conditional order dated 17.04.2026, passed in the said Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 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.80 of 2026 and unless Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 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.5,000/- through the learned counsel for the opposite party no.2 appearing in the record, the copy of which is annexed with the brief. Hence, it is submitted that Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 be restored to its original file.

Considering the aforesaid submission of the learned counsel for the petitioners, Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 is restored to its original file to the stage at which, it was before its dismissal.

List Cr.M.P. No.80 of 2026 under the appropriate heading after a week before the appropriate Bench.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)

06.11.2026
Sonu-