

GAHC010035882025



THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : WP(C)/1011/2025

M/S MEGHALAYA CONSTRUCTTON AND SUPPLY COMPANY
A PARTNERSHIP FIRM HAVING ITS HEAD OFFICE AT PATAN TEHSIL NEEM
KA THANA DISTRICT SIKAR RAJASTHAN ,
REPRESENTED BY ITS PARTNER SUNIL DEWAN , AGE 50 YRS.,
S/O- LATE MADAN LAL DEWAN,

RESIDENT OF 124 TULSI RAM MARG GURU JAMBESHWAR NAGAR,
VAISHALI NAGAR, JAIPUR RAJASTHAN-302021

VERSUS

HINDUSTAN STEELWORKS CONSTRUCTION LIMITED AND ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE HEAD CPG ,
HEAD OFFICE AT 3RD FLOOR NBCC SQUARE PLOT NO III F2 ACTION
AREA III NEW TOWN, RAJARHAT,
P.O- AKANDAKESHARI, KOLKATA, PIN-700135

2:THE HEAD CPG HINDUSTAN CONSTRUCTION LIMITED
3RD FLOOR NBCC SQUARE PLOT NO III F2 ACTION AREA III NEW TOWN
RAJARHAT

P.O AKANDAKESHARI
KOLKATA
PIN-700135

3:THE UNION OF INDIA
REP. BY THE MINISTRY OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS
NEW DELHI-01

4:THE ZONAL HEAD NE HINDUSTAN STEEL WORKS CONSTRUCTION
LIMITED
H/O -TRIDIB KUMAR BORKAKOTY

1ST FLOOR
AEC ROAD
JALUKBARI
GUWAHATI-1

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR RAB HUSSAIN, MR A A AHMED, MRS. S ROY, MR. A BISWAS

Advocate for the Respondent : DY.S.G.I., MR H GUPTA(C.G.C)

**BEFORE
JOINT REGISTRAR (JUDL.) MR. CHINMOY BARUAH**

ORDER

Date : 22.04.2026

Case taken up before the Lawazima Court.

None appears on behalf of the petitioner.

Perused the records.

Pursuant of the recent office note dated 07.04.2026 reveals that the petitioner has taken fresh steps for issuance of notice to the respondent Nos. 1, 2 & 3 via registered post with A/D, via usual process and via way of *dasti mode* as well.

However, the office note dated 07.04.2026 has stated that notice could not be issued to the respondent No. 3, as the said respondent is being duly represented in the instant petition. In this regard, it may be mentioned that the Hon'ble Court vide its order dated 21.02.2025 had observed that learned CGC, Mr. H. Gupta has appeared on behalf of the respondent No. 3.

The office note dated 07.04.2026 further states that the notices through speed post and usual process issued to the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 on 13.03.2025 & 12.03.2025 respectively, no mention regarding issuance of notice through *dasti mode* was found in the office note dated 07.04.2026.

Now, in response to the above mentioned notices, it appears that:—

(i) No A/D cards or un-served notices have been received in respect of the notice issued through registered post with A/D.

(ii) However, in regard to the notice issued through usual process, it appears that the

*process server's report has been received by the Registry and the same have been kept in the record at **Flag-'SR' in the Part-III file**. As per the said report, notice has been duly served upon the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 and it appears that the receipt of the said notice have been duly acknowledged by the concerned authority by putting signature and the official seal on the return copy of the notice.*

In view of the observations made above, it may be said that **service of notice upon the respondent Nos. 1 & 2 has been completed.**

Apart from above, it has been observed that the concerned section has mentioned that the notice has not been issued upon the respondent No. 4 (*i.e., **The Zonal Head (N.E.) Hindustan Steel Works Constructions Limited, H/O TridiB Kumar Borkakoty***), as there are no such order of the Hon'ble Court directing such issuance.

In view of the observations made above, the matter may be placed before the Hon'ble Court for necessary orders regarding respondent No. 4.

Joint Registrar (Judicial)

Comparing Assistant