IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(Cr.) No. 394 of 2026

Amar Nath, aged about 58 years, son of Kedar Nath Mittal, resident of Nath Niwas, Main Road, Saraidhela, P.O. + P.S. Saraidhela, District Dhanbad **… … Petitioner**

Versus

The Central Bureau of Investigation **… … Respondent**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Jasvindar Mazumdar, Advocate
For the CBI : Mr. Prashant Pallav, Advocate

05/**04.11.2026** Heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the following relief:

"For issuance of an appropriate writ/order/direction, particularly a writ in the nature of mandamus giving direction to the learned trial court to expedite the trial in connection with R.C. Case No.08 (A)/2016 (D) registered for the offence under Section 13 (2) r/w 13 (1) (d) of PC Act and under Section 120 B, 420, 467, 468, 471 of IPC and conclude the same within a time frame, which is now pending in the court of learned District & Additional Sessions Judge – XI – cum – Special Judge, C.B.I. Dhanbad."

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that charge has not been framed in the present case, although the charge sheet was submitted as back as in the year 2019 and the cognizance was also taken on 31.07.2019.

4. The learned counsel for the opposite party has submitted that there are a number of accused persons in this case and the last order annexed with the writ petition reveals that as of 26.05.2026, one discharge petition filed by one of the co-accused is still pending for consideration. He submits that since the trial has not been split, unless the discharge petition is taken up and decided, there is no question of any direction for expeditious trial at this stage.

5. To this, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the discharge petition has been filed on behalf of co-accused.

However, the case of the petitioner is being taken up along with the co-accused.

6. The fact also remains that the co-accused who filed the discharge petition, which is pending before the trial court, is not even a party before this Court.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the fact that the case is not yet ripe for framing of charge as certain discharge petition of the co-accused who are being proceeded with the petitioner is still pending before the authority, this Court is of the view that no positive direction with regard to expeditious trial can be issued at this stage.

8. However, there can be no dispute that charge sheet having filed in the year 2019, the court is required to take appropriate steps so that the parties cooperate in the proceedings and the case is taken to a logical end.

9. This writ petition is disposed of.

10. Pending interlocutory application, if any, stands closed.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Date of Order: 04.11.2026
Date of uploading:04.11.2026
Saurav/-