

Fulena Rawat Vs. Anil Pandey Managing Director Mineral Area Development Authority and Anr

Fulena Rawat Vs. Anil Pandey Managing Director Mineral Area Development Authority and Anr

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/76376

Court : Jharkhand

Decided On : Jul-29-2016

Appellant : Fulena Rawat

Respondent : Anil Pandey Managing Director Mineral Area Development Authority and Anr

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. 2973 of 2016
--- Anirox Pigment Ltd. Aama Ghata Govindpur, Dhanbad--- ---- Petitioner Versus
1. The State of Jharkhand through the Labour Commissioner - cum - Resource Officer, Govt. of Jharkhand 2. The Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad 3. The Labour Superintendent, Dhanbad 4. M/s Anirox Pigment Ltd through its Director 5. General Manager, IDBI Bank Ltd, Kolkata 6. Deputy General Manager, IDBI Bank Ltd., Kolkata 7. Authorized Officer - cum - Recovery Officer, IDBI Bank Ltd. Kolkata --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Niraj Narayan Mishra, Advocate For the Resp - State: Mr. Srijit Choudhary, Sr. SC-III --- 03/ 29.07.2016 Learned counsel for the petitioner, on instruction, seeks permission to withdraw this writ application with liberty to move the appropriate forum. Counsel for the Respondents are present. Accordingly, writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. It is up to the petitioner to invoke any other remedy available under law. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. 3511 of 2016
--- Nilai Educational Trust, Ranchi. Petitioner Versus 1. All India Council for
Technical Education, New Delhi.

2. The Chairman, All India Council for Technical Education, New Delhi.

3. The Secretary, All India Council for Technical Education, New Delhi.

4. The Director, Approval Bureau, All India Council for Technical Education, New
Delhi.

5. State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Higher and Technical Education,
Jharkhand Respondents CORAM: The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar
Singh For the Petitioner: M/s Anil Kr. Sinha, Sr. Advocate, Ritu Kumar, Vikash
Kumar, Advocates For the Resp -AICTE: Mr. P.A.S. Pati, Advocate --- 05/
29.07.2016 Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Department of
Higher and Technical Education, Government of Jharkhand is also a necessary
party in the instant matter and it should also be impleaded.

2. Let the State of Jharkhand through the Secretary, Higher and Technical
Education be impleaded as Respondent No. 5 in the instant case, for which
necessary correction be carried out by the counsel for the petitioner in red ink
during course of the day and copy of the entire pleadings be also served on the
counsel for the State and receipt thereof be also filed by tomorrow, so that name
of the State counsel be also reflected in the cause list henceforth.

3. The order dated 21.07.2016 contains more or less the thrust of the submissions
of the parties, which however need not be reproduced hereunder. By Annexure-12
e-mail addressed to the the petitioner Institute dated 01.02.2016, the Respondent
AICTE made a request to the petitioner to send the request on or before
14.02.2016 for getting approval for 2016-17 Session, couched in the following
language. In view of the above, you are requested to send a request only through
e-mail (approval2016@aicteindia.org) on or before 14.02.2016 with a scanned
copy of the request letter (prepared in your Institutions official letterhead) for
getting Approval for 2016-17 in case of your Institution. In case if your Institution

fails to send a request on or before 14.02.2016, your Institution will continue to get No-EQA/No-Admission for 2016-17 also.

4. Petitioner Institute made a request letter for restoration of approval for the 2. academic session 2015-16 and EOA for 2016-17 through e-mail as well as scanned copy for getting approval for 2016-17 Session (Annexure-13). It tried to make out a case that the subject matter of withdrawal of recognition of the Institute is sub- judice before the learned Division Bench in L.P.A. No. 612/2015 and L.P.A. No. 676/2015. Under the Regulation 2012 of Approval Process Handbook (2016-17, petitioner Institute possesses more than the required minimum 2.52 acres of mortgaged free land and had also made its entire infrastructure in the shape of class- rooms, library and laboratory, etc and is being used for imparting the above courses.

5. Petitioner had to approach this Court in Writ petition WPS No. 2260/2016 as no decision was taken on his request for a considerable length of time. The Respondent AICTE were granted time earlier to file counter affidavit in the said writ petition. On 16.06.2016 it was pointed out by the petitioner that there are time line to be maintained by the AICTE for taking a decision on the application by such a Institute as there is a schedule of time for the admission process also to be followed. Vide Annexure-14 order dated 16.06.2016, while granting further three weeks time to enable the Respondent AICTE to take a decision on the petitioner's application and file affidavit before the next date fixed i.e. 12.07.2016, it was made clear that if affidavit in response does not come by the said date, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 shall be called to appear in person. Annexure-15 order dated 28.06.2016, impugned in the present writ application, was passed on the application of the petitioner thereafter by the Standing Appellate Committee of AICTE.

6. The impugned order recites background history of the Institute and cancellation of its recommendation earlier including the order passed by the LPA Court dated 10.12.2015 and finally records reasons for not recommending further extension of approval. The stand of the Respondent have now been brought on record through counter affidavit which however does not indicate that any inspection was carried out on the part of AICTE in the matter of consideration for grant of approval /

extension of approval to the petitioner Institute for the Session 3. 2016-17.

7. Much submission have been canvassed on behalf of learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner and retorted by the learned counsel for AICTE. However, one of the basic questions which remained unanswered on the part of AICTE is, whether the conclusion drawn in the impugned order are based upon a physical inspection of the Institute on the question of approval / extension of approval for the Session 2016-17. In such circumstances, it would be wholly futile to proceed on an imagined state of circumstances. The Respondent AICTE should carry out an inspection of the Institute in the matter of consideration for approval for 2016-17 Session within ten days from today. If so required, petitioner would deposit the inspection fee, as per demand of AICTE forthwith. Inspection be carried out in the presence of the representative of the petitioner Institute. It would be open for AICTE and its inspecting team to satisfy itself on all relevant documents and materials on the basis of inspection. It would also be open for AICTE to ask for undertaking on the part of the petitioner to be satisfied. If fresh inspection necessitates reconsideration of the matter, AICTE should not refrain from indulging in exercise also within the time stipulated.

8. List the case accordingly on 10.08.2016 by which date, the Respondent AICTE should come out with a report and any decision on such reconsideration. It is made clear that the Respondent AICTE should not delay the matter any further on that count.

9. Let a copy of the order be handed over to the counsel for the Respondent AICTE. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI C.M.P. No. 360 of 2015 --- Kumari Indu --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Tapan Kr. Mishra, Advocate For the O.P. - State: JC to AG --- 03/ 29.07.2016 Heard counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner seeks restoration of WPS No. 662/2014 which was dismissed for non-prosecution by order dated 24.08.2015.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that he had gone to attend his sister-in-law who was admitted for treatment as a cancer patient and was not able to attend the Court. Petitioner would suffer irreparably, if writ petition is not restored for no fault of his.

4. Counsel for the opposite party submits that Respondent have filed their counter affidavit in the writ petition and according to the stand, prayer of the petitioner was without any merit. However, on the fateful day, writ petition was dismissed due to non appearance of the counsel for the petitioner.

5. Having considered the submissions of the parties and the reasons stated in the instant petition, let WPS No. 662/2014 be restored to its original file, subject to payment of cost of Rs. 1000/- in JHALSA within a period of two weeks and file a receipt thereof in the Registry. Failure to deposit the cost within the time stipulated would render the order of restoration inoperative.

6. CMP stands disposed of accordingly. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI C.M.P. No. 343 of 2015 --- Ram Charan Munda --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus M/s Central Coalfields Limited through its Chairman - cum - Managing Director & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Nand Kishore Pd. Sinha, Advocate For the O.P. - CCL: M/s A.K. Das, Anjani Kumar, Advocates --- 04/ 29.07.2016 Petitioner seeks restoration of WPS No. 6602/2014 which was dismissed for non-compliance of peremptory order dated 17.06.2015 for failure to remove certain defects.

2. It is stated in the petition that defects could be removed one day after the time prescribed. Petitioner has not committed any lapse on his part, but would suffer irreparable loss and injury, if writ petition is not restored.

3. Counsel for the opposite party does not oppose the prayer.

4. Having regard to the statement made in the instant petition and reasons stated therein, let WPS No. 6602/2014 be restored to its original file, subject to payment of cost of Rs. 500/- in JHALSA within a period of two weeks and file a receipt

thereof in the Registry. Failure to deposit the cost within the time stipulated would render the order of restoration inoperative.

5. CMP stands disposed of accordingly. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 269 of 2015 --- Fulena Rawat --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus 1. Anil Pandey, Managing Director, Mineral Area Development Authority, Dhanbad 2. The State of Jharkhand --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Rakesh Kr. Sinha, Advocate For the O.P. - MADA: M/s Bhawesh Kumar, Ravi Kumar, Advocates --- 03/ 29.07.2016 Counsel for the opposite party submits that a show-cause has been filed on 11.05.2015 enclosing a reasoned order dated 07.04.2016 passed in compliance of the order under offence. As per the reasoned order, a sum of Rs. 20,13,586/- has been found to be admissible against the various post retirement and service dues. Payments are to be made in installment of Rs. 50,000/- per month, as per the scheme framed for the retired employees of MADA keeping into account the weak financial condition of the organization.

2. As per the reasoned order, petitioner may file an objection before the competent authority under MADA within a period of 15 days, if not satisfied with the computation of the amount.

3. In that view of the matter, contempt petition is disposed of. Proceedings are dropped. However, petitioner is at liberty to file objection if not satisfied. It is pointed out that if installments are not being paid within the time, petitioner may be given liberty to approach this Court once again. It goes without saying. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI C.M.P. No. 255 of 2015 --- Vijay Kumar Thakur --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus Jharkhand Gramin Bank through its Chairman & Disciplinary Authority --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. V.N. Jha, Advocate For the O.P. - Bank: M/s Rajesh Kumar, Amit Kr. Sinha, Advocates --- 05/ 29.07.2016 Heard counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner seeks restoration of WPS No. 5815/2013 which was dismissed for non-compliance of peremptory order dated 07.02.2014 for failure to remove

certain defects.

3. Counsel for the petitioner submits that due to unavoidable circumstances, he could not be present on the date on which peremptory order was passed. As a result, surviving defects could not be cured within the time prescribed. Petitioner who is not at fault, would suffer irreparable loss and injury, if writ petition is not restored.

4. Counsel for the opposite party does not oppose the prayer.

5. In view of the prayer made and reasons stated in the instant petition, let WPS No. 5815/2013 be restored to its original file. Counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove surviving defect in the writ petition within two weeks from today.

6. CMP stands disposed of accordingly. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 141 of 2015 --- Sachida Nand Pandey --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Pankaj Kumar, Advocate For the O.P. - State: Mr. Pratyush Lala, JC to GP-IV --- 05/ 29.07.2016 The show-cause filed on behalf of Opposite Party No. 2 does not show payment of provident fund for all the outstanding periods as still, opposite party concerned is in the process of correspondence with certain authorities where petitioner was earlier posted.

2. In the meantime, a total sum of Rs. 7.69 lakhs have been paid towards provident fund dues which, according to the petitioner, is much less than what is actually due. Opposite party no. 2 is required to ascertain any other balance dues of the petitioner for the period in question and ensure payment within a period of four weeks. He would also supply break-up of the dues and payment made along with the supplementary show-cause before the next date, failing which on the next date, he will be called to appear in person.

3. List the case accordingly after four weeks on the tied up day. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 688 of 2014 --- Jitendra Kumar Singh --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Chief Secretary, Govt. of Jharkhand 2. Sri Prakash Kumar Singh, Registrar, Sidhu Kanhu Murmu University, Dumka 3. Sri Dharendra Nath Ojha, Director, Higher Education, Govt. of Jharkhand --- --- ---
Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the
Petitioner: Mr. Kailash Pd. Deo, Advocate For the O.P. - State: Mr. Prashant Kr.
Singh, GP-IV For the O.P. No. 2: Dr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate --- 10/ 29.07.2016
Petitioner has failed to fulfill the requirement to enable the opposite party of the
University to ensure compliance of the direction as no succession certificate have
been produced till date despite several adjournments.

2. In that view of the matter, for the present, no case for contempt is made out. It is
up to the petitioner to obtain a succession certificate as required by the opposite
party authorities of the University and thereafter pursue his claim.

3. Contempt petition stands disposed of. Proceedings are dropped. (Aparesh
Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cont. Case (Civil) No. 241 of 2014 --- Arun Kumar Trivedi --- --- --- Petitioner
Versus 1. The State of Jharkhand 2. Ajay Kumar Singh, Secretary, Jharkhand Urja
Vikash Nigam Limited 3. P.K. Srivastava, Joint Secretary (II), Jharkhand Urja
Vikash Nigam Limited --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice
Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mrs. Ranjana Mukherjee, Advocate For
the O.P. No. 2&3: Mr. Om Prakash Tiwary, Advocate --- 07/ 29.07.2016 In the
show-cause filed on 25.07.2016, opposite parties have referred to the
communication dated 21.07.2016 also enclosed, whereunder admissible dues
towards full pension, gratuity, arrears of pension, arrears of salary, group saving
scheme, leave encashment, etc, have been sanctioned. It is further stated that 15
days more time be allowed to make the payment.

2. On the aforesaid undertaking, contempt petition is disposed of. Proceedings are
dropped. It is expected that undertaking so given should be obeyed in its letter and
spirit and failure thereof would be treated very seriously. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J)
Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil)
No. 361 of 2016 --- M/s Shah Brothers --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of
Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice

Apresh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Anil Kr. Sinha, Sr. Advocate For the O.P. - State: JC to AG --- 06/ 29.07.2016 Opposite Party Nos. 2 and 3 are present in Court today. A prayer is made on the ground of illness of learned Advocate General for adjournment. List the case accordingly on 05.08.2016 when opposite party nos. 2 and 3 shall remain present. (Apresh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 153 of 2013 --- Bimalendra Kumar Mishra --- --- --- Petitioner Versus

1. Ravindra Nath Sen, Chairman, Damodar Valley Corporation
2. Ravindra Nath Sen, Secretary, Damodar Valley Corporation
3. A. Bakshi, Director, Human Resources Development, Damodar Valley Corporation
4. N.K. Verma, Joint Director of Personnel (Recruitment), Damodar Valley Corporation
5. S.R. Maji, Coal Superintendent & Agent, D.V.C., Bermo Mines, Bokaro --- --- --- Opp. Parties with Civil Review No. 75 of 2015 --- Damodar Valley Corporation --- --- --- Petitioner Versus

1. Bimalendra Kumar Mishra
2. The Secretary, D.V.C. Tower
3. The Director (Tech), D.V.C. Tower
4. The Director, Human Resources Development, D.V.C. Tower
5. The Joint Director of Personnel (Recruitment), D.V.C. Tower
6. The Coal Superintendent and Agent, Damodar Valley Corporation, Bermo Mines, Bokaro --- --- --- Opp. Parties CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Apresh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Sunil Kr. Mahto, Advocate in Cont. 153/2013 M/s R.N. Sahay, Sr. Advocate, Tapas Kabiraj, Advocate in Civil Review No. 75/2015 For the O.P. - DVC: M/s R.N. Sahay, Sr. Advocate, Tapas Kabiraj,

Advocate For the O.P. No. 1: Mr. Sunil Kr. Mahto, Advocate --- Civil Review No. 75/2015 08/ 29.07.2016 Review petitioner was the Respondents in WPS No. 4610/2012 who has sought review of the judgment dated 11.09.2012 passed in the said case, which reads as under: Present petition is filed seeking the writ of mandamus commanding the respondent authorities to declare the results of the petitioner for the recruitment to the post of Survey Officer - post no. - 2008/D-9 vide Office Memorandum No.- PLR- Adv./2008/1675 dated November 21, 2008 in the D.V.C. Bermo Mines for which petitioner was interviewed on 31.03.2009. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that result has not been declared as yet. In the opinion of this Court, interest of justice will be served, if a direction is issued to the respondents to declare the result of the examination. Accordingly, present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to declare the results of Survey Officer, preferably within 90 days from today.

2. Learned counsel for the review petitioner submits by referring to the contents of the petition that as a matter of fact, order dated 11.09.2012 was passed on the 2. first date and the stand of the Respondent - Damodar Valley Corporation was not on record. It has so transpired that internal advertisement of 21.11.2008 in which the petitioner participated in interview as only candidate for promotion to the post of Survey Officer, was never proceeded and concluded. It is their case that interview was held on 31.03.2009, but the process was aborted. It is their case that the Respondents / Review Petitioner - Damodar Valley Corporation has chosen to fill up the post of Survey Officer through direct recruitment by open advertisement and not through internal departmental exam / interview. In such circumstances, on the date on which writ petition was disposed of, the aforesaid state of facts could not be brought to the notice of the learned Single Judge as it was decided on the first day itself. Therefore, the review petitioner seek recall of the said order.

3. Counsel for the writ petitioner / Respondent No. 1 herein, submits that the remedy of the review petitioner, if aggrieved by the impugned order, lies elsewhere in appeal as there is no infirmity warranting recall of the order passed in the writ petition. He however does not dispute the contention on facts that the recruitment process of Survey Officer through internal advertisement, was never taken to its

logical conclusion.

4. Having considered the rival pleas of the parties, this Court is satisfied that in absence of the stand of the Respondents in the writ petition, direction to declare the result of the internal recruitment exercise for the post of Survey Officer, were issued which, as a matter of fact, could not be acted upon and the process itself having been aborted. The stand of the Respondent / Review Petitioner have been brought on record in the present review petition, but it will be in the interest of justice that such direction be recalled as it would not be an effective direction in the wake of the process of internal recruitment being aborted. Therefore, review petition is allowed. The direction passed in the writ petition vide order dated 11.09.2012 needs to be recalled and it is accordingly recalled. Cont. Case (Civil) No. 153/2013 In view of the order passed in the review petition, no case of contempt survives. Accordingly, contempt petition is disposed of. Proceedings are dropped. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 156 of 2015 --- Nikhil Gupta --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus 1. Sri Rabindra Singh, M.D. M.A.D.A., Dhanbad 2. The State of Jharkhand --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Someshwar Roy, Advocate For the O.P. - MADA: M/s Bhawesh Kumar, Ravi Kumar, Advocates --- 03/ 29.07.2016 Counsel for the opposite party submits that a show-cause has been filed on 27.07.2016 enclosing a reasoned order dated 05.05.2016 passed in compliance of the order under offence. As per the reasoned order, a sum of Rs. 15,32,920/- has been found to be admissible against the various post retirement and service dues. Payments are to be made in installment of Rs. 50,000/- per month, as per the scheme framed for the retired employees of MADA keeping into account the weak financial condition of the organization.

2. As per the reasoned order, petitioner may file an objection before the competent authority under MADA within a period of 15 days, if not satisfied with the computation of the amount.

3. In that view of the matter, contempt petition is disposed of. Proceedings are dropped. However, petitioner is at liberty to file objection if not satisfied. It is

pointed out that if installments are not being paid within the time, petitioner may be given liberty to approach this Court once again. It goes without saying. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 262 of 2014 --- Upendra Narayan Singh --- --- --- Petitioner Versus 1. Ravindra Singh, Managing Director, Mineral Area Development Authority, Dhanbad 2. The State of Jharkhand --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM: The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Someshwar Roy, Advocate For the O.P. - MADA: M/s Bhawesh Kumar, Ravi Kumar, Advocates --- 10/ 29.07.2016 A show-cause has been filed on behalf of opposite party of MADA dated 27.07.2016 enclosing the reasoned order dated 21.07.2016 (Annexure-A) whereunder, admissible dues of the petitioner under post retirement and other service dues have been computed at Rs. 7,73,122/- and are to be paid in monthly installments of Rs. 50,000/-, as per the scheme applicable to the retired employees of MADA.

2. As per the reasoned order, petitioner may file an objection before the competent authority under MADA within a period of 15 days, if not satisfied with the computation of the amount.

3. In that view of the matter, contempt petition is disposed of. Proceedings are dropped. However, petitioner is at liberty to file objection if not satisfied. It is pointed out that if installments are not being paid within the time, petitioner may be given liberty to approach this Court once again. It goes without saying. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 141 of 2014 --- Prof. Shree Prakash Dwivedi --- --- --- Petitioner Versus 1. The State of Jharkhand 2. Shri Sudin Mahto, Registrar, Kolhan University, Chaibasa 3. Dr. Dharendra Kumar Ojha, Director, H.R.D. Department, Higher Education, Govt. of Jharkhand--- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM: The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. S.K. Pandey, Advocate For the O.P. - State: Mr. Prashant Kr. Singh, GP-VI For the O.P. No. 2: Dr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Advocate 08/ 29.07.2016 By way of last indulgence, two weeks more time is allowed to the opposite party to show compliance of the order, failing which, on the next date, both opposite party nos. 2 and 3 shall be called to appear in person to explain as to why proceedings be not

initiated against them for willful disobedience of the order of this Court. List the case in the second week of August on a tied up day. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. 40 of 2014 --- M/s Subhlaxmi Tradvin Pvt. Ltd. --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & another --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. Amit Sinha, Advocate For the O.P. - State: Mr. Prashant Kr. Singh, GP-VI --- 05/ 29.07.2016 Learned counsel for the State on the basis of the show-cause filed on behalf of opposite party no. 3, submits that subject matter relating to sanction of a building plan in rural areas does not fall within the domain of Urban Development and Housing Department. He however seeks one more indulgence to obtain instruction from the concerned authority of the Respondent State as to under which Department jurisdiction, such subject matter lie. Let the matter be passed over for the day. (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI Cont. Case (Civil) No. of 2015 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Opp. Parties --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Advocate For the O.P. - State: --- 05/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- --- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the

Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/ IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI W.P. (C) No. of 2016 --- --- --- ---- Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand & others --- --- --- Respondents --- CORAM:The Honble Mr. Justice Aparesh Kumar Singh For the Petitioner: Mr. , Advocate For the Resp - State: --- 02/ 29.07.2016 (Aparesh Kumar Singh, J) Ranjeet/

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com