

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
WP(C) No.2224 of 2026

1. Abhijeet Goswami (age about 65 Years) S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami,
2. Dewashish Goswami (age about 62 Years) S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami,
Both residents of 4th floor, flat no.404, Vardhman Kunj, Station Road, besides Jain Mandir, P.O. & P.S.- Suriya, Distt.- Giridih.
... Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand through Commissioner, North Chhotanagpur Division, P.O. & P.S. Sadar, District-Hazaribag.
2. Commissioner, North Chhotanagpur Division, P.O. & P.S. Sadar, District-Hazaribag.
3. Deputy Commissioner cum District Magistrate, P.O. & P.S. Giridih, District-Giridih.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bagodar-Sariya, P.O. & P.S. Sariya, District-Giridih.
5. Premlata Devi W/o Late Bimal Chand,
6. Sarad Chand S/o Late Bimal Chand,
7. Manish Chand S/o Late Bimal Chand,
Respondent nos. 5 to 7 are all Residents of B/11, City Centre, Sector-4, P.O. & P.S.- Sector 4D, Bokaro Steel City, Pin-827004.
8. Nilu Devi D/o Late Bimal Chand,
Respondent no. 8 Resident of flat no.32, Sakar Amrapali Gardens, Golapur, Sadar Bazar, P.O. & P.S.-Danapur, Patna, Bihar-801 503.
..... Respondents

9. Amit Kumar Goswami S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami,
10. Gopi Ranjan Goswami S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami,
11. Partha Sarki Goswami S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami,
Proforma respondent nos. 9 to 11 are all residents of Village-Sariya, P.O. & P.S.- Sariya, District- Sariya.
12. Govinda Kumar Goswami S/o Late Prabodh Kumar Goswami, resident of Ashirwad Maurya Colony, Lane no.1, Canary Hill Road, P.O.-GPO, P.S.- Sadar, District-Hazaribagh.
... Proforma respondent(s).

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Pratyush Kumar, Advocate
Mr. V. Chaturvedi, Advocate
For the State : AC to AG

.....

02 /06.04.2026: The defects pointed out by the office is ignored.

2. Heard the learned counsel representing the petitioners and

the learned counsel representing the respondents.

3. Considering the nature of the order, I did not find it necessary to direct the respondents to file counter affidavit.

4. In the eviction proceeding an order was passed against these petitioners who allegedly are the tenants. The petitioners thereafter filed Revision Application before the Revisional Authority i.e. the Commissioner, North Chhotangapur Division, Hazaribagh, which is pending. In the meantime, the Sub-Divisional Officer, i.e. Rent Controller issued a notice-cum-eviction to execute the order of eviction.

5. The grievance of the petitioners is that the Revision Application has yet not been decided and the stay application which has also been filed has also not been taken up. In spite of these applications if the petitioners are evicted, the Revision Application will become infructuous. It is his case that the petitioners have good case as the petitioners are denying the relationship of landlord and tenant.

6. Considering the submission of the parties and after going through the records, I find that it is an admitted fact that the Revision Application is pending and in the aforesaid Revision Application being House Control Revision No. 68 of 2025 which is pending before the Commissioner, North Chotanagpur Division, Hazaribagh an application for stay of the eviction has also been filed.

7. Considering the fact that the revision has been filed and

the Revisional Authority is *in seisin* with the matter, I direct the petitioners to approach the Commissioner, North Chotanagpur Division, Hazaribagh to decide the application of stay which has been filed by the petitioners within a week from the date of production of the copy of this order and after hearing the parties dispose of the revision within one week thereafter.

8. The petitioners are directed to bring this order to the notice of the Revisional Authority by 13.04.2026.

9. Till 17.04.2026, no coercive steps should be taken against the petitioners.

10. Accordingly, this writ petition is **disposed of**.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

06.04.2026
Tanuj/CP-2

Uploaded on 07.04.2026