

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**(Civil Appellate Jurisdiction)**  
**F.A. No. 20 of 2003**

.....

|                                                 |      |       |             |
|-------------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------------|
| Central Mine Planning and Design Institute Ltd. | .... | ..... | Appellant   |
| <b>Versus</b>                                   |      |       |             |
| Solachand Nathany & Others                      | .... | ..... | Respondents |

WITH  
**F.A. No. 21 of 2003**

.....

|                                            |      |       |             |
|--------------------------------------------|------|-------|-------------|
| Central Mine Planning and Design Institute | .... | ..... | Appellant   |
| <b>Versus</b>                              |      |       |             |
| Solachand Nathany & Others                 | .... | ..... | Respondents |

WITH  
**W.P. (C) No. 3164 of 2003**

.....

|                                 |      |       |             |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------------|
| Ranchi Dist. Bar Association    | .... | ..... | Petitioner  |
| <b>Versus</b>                   |      |       |             |
| The State of Jharkhand & Others | .... | ..... | Respondents |

WITH  
**W.P. (C) No. 3165 of 2003**

.....

|                                 |      |       |             |
|---------------------------------|------|-------|-------------|
| Ranchi Dist. Bar Association    | .... | ..... | Petitioner  |
| <b>Versus</b>                   |      |       |             |
| The State of Jharkhand & Others | .... | ..... | Respondents |

WITH  
**C.O. No. 1 of 2004**

.....

|                              |       |       |                 |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|
| Sulochana Nathani & Another  | ..... |       | Cross-Objectors |
| <b>Versus</b>                |       |       |                 |
| State of Jharkhand & Another | ....  | ..... | Respondents     |

WITH  
**C.O. No. 2 of 2004**

.....

|                              |      |       |                 |
|------------------------------|------|-------|-----------------|
| Sulochana Nathani & Another  | .... |       | Cross-Objectors |
| <b>Versus</b>                |      |       |                 |
| State of Jharkhand & Another | .... | ..... | Respondents     |

.....

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KAILASH PRASAD DEO**  
**(Through : Video Conferencing)**

.....

|                         |                                                                            |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant       | : Mr. Anoop Kumar Mehta, Advocate.                                         |
| For the Respondents     | : Mr. A.K. Das, Advocate<br>[In F.A. Nos. 20/2003 & 21/2003]               |
| For the Respondents     | : Mr. Amitabh Prasad, Advocate.<br>[In W.P. (C) No. 3164/2003 / 3165/2003] |
| For the Cross-Objectors | : Mr. Rohit Roy, Advocate.<br>[In C.O. Nos. 1/2004 & 2/2004]               |

.....

**27/17.03.2021.**

I.A. No. 1956/2005 has been in F.A. No. 20/2003 for vacating the stay granted by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated

05.10.2004.

I.A. No. 1957/2005 has been in F.A. No. 21/2003 for vacating the stay granted by Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 05.10.2004.

Both the first appeals have already been admitted. A large number of analogous matters are listed together.

Learned counsel for the respondents has sought for an adjournment on the ground that file has to be reconstructed.

Under the aforesaid circumstances, it would not be proper to keep interlocutory applications pending for 16 years, if the first appeal has been admitted and the interim order have been passed, then at the time of final adjudication of the appeal, such applications for vacating stay shall be considered.

Accordingly, I.A. No. 1956/2005 & I.A. No. 1957/2005 are disposed of so as to adjudicate the first appeals along with analogous matters.

Put up these cases when the physical court starts.

**(Kailash Prasad Deo, J.)**

Sunil/-