

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
F. A. No. 20 of 2003

Central Mine Planning and Design Institute Ltd.			Appellant
Versus			
Solachand Nathany and Anr.			Respondents
With			
F. A. No. 21 of 2003			
Central Mine Planning and Design Institute Ltd.			Appellant
Versus			
Solachand Nathany and Ors.			Respondents
With			
W. P (C) No. 3164 of 2003			
Ranchi Dist. Bar Association			Appellant
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand			Respondent
With			
W. P (C) No. 3165 of 2003			
Ranchi Dist. Bar Association			Appellant
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand			Respondent
With			
C. O. No. 01 of 2004			
Sulochana Nathany & Anr.			Appellants
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand & Anr.			Respondent
With			
C. O. No. 02 of 2004			
Sulochana Nathany & Anr.			Appellants
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand & Anr.			Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GAUTAM KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Appellants	: M/s Anoop Kr. Mehta, Advocate & Manish Kumar, Advocate (in FA 20 & 21/03) M/s Indrajit Sinha, Shishir Suman & Rohit Roy, Advocates (in C.O. 1 & 2/04)
For the Respondents	: M/s A.K. Das, S.P. Roy, Advocates
For the State	: Mr. Diva Kant Roy, A.C. to S.C. (Mines)-I

Oral Order

31 / Dated : 28.03.2022

I.A. No. 879/22 in C.O. No. 1 /04, I.A. No. 881/22 in C.O. No. 2/04,
I.A. No. 1239/22 in F.A. No. 20/03 & I.A. No. 1238/22 in F.A. 21/03

Heard learned counsel for the appellants in these interlocutory applications which have been filed for substitution the name of legal heir of the deceased Sulochana Nathani @ Solachand Nathany, wife of Krishna Kumar Nathany, who died on 02.08.2021.

It is submitted that there is minor delay in filing the substitution petition which occasioned due to ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and, therefore, it is prayed to condone the delay in filing the substitution petition. It is further submitted that the legal heir of Sulochana Nathani @ Solachand Nathany is her son Anshuman Nathani in whose favour right to sue survives.

Learned counsel for the other side has raised no serious objection.

Under the circumstances, all the interlocutory applications are allowed.

Let the name of legal heir Anshuman Nathani be substituted in place of Sulochana Nathani @ Solachand Nathany.

Office is directed to make necessary entries in the cause title of the memo of C.O./F.A.

I.A. No. 92 of 2004 in W.P.(C) No. 3164 2003

Learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 2 does not want to press the present interlocutory application.

Accordingly, I.A. No. 92 of 2004 is dismissed as not pressed.

Let these cases be listed after five weeks under the appropriate heading.

(Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J.)

AKT