

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(C) No. 2965 of 2026

M/s Terrier Security Services (India) Pvt. Ltd., registered office address: No.3/3/2, Bellandur Gate Sarjapur Main Road, Bengaluru, Karnataka, represented by Prabhat Srivastava, S/o Shri Dilip Srivastav, office address-3rd Floor House No.139, Raj Palace, Line No.05, Kasidih, P.O. Sakchi, P.s. Sakchi Jamshedpur, District East Singhbhum, Jharkhand

.... Petitioner(s).

Versus

1. The Deputy Director, Employees, State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, P.O- Namkum, P.S. Namkum, Dist Ranchi
2. The Regional Director, Employees State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Jharkhand, at P.O. + P.S. Namkum, Dist Ranchi
3. The Recovery Officer, Employees State Insurance Corporation, Regional Office, Jharkhand, at P.O. + P.S. Namkum, Dist Ranchi
4. The Chairman, YES Bank, House, Office Western Express Highway, P.O. & P.S Santacruz (East) Mumbai, Maharashtra
5. Branch Manager, YES Bank, Part ground Floor, Apsara Hotel Plot No.1646/6, Ward No.18, Circular Road Lalpur, P.O. & P.S. Lalpur, Dist Ranch, Jharkhand

... Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Ms. Khushboo Kataruka, Advocate
Ms. Ushma Pandey, Advocate
For the Resp-ESIC : Mr. Ashutosh Anand, Advocate

.....

02/ 27.04.2026 Heard, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that due to some technical error admittedly, committed by the petitioner himself, the demand has increased by few folds.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner refers to Annexure-3 which would suggest that in the month of May, 2020, the contribution suddenly raised to Rs. 19,43,677/- which was earlier only Rs. 2 lakhs and odd. It is the contention of the petitioner that was an error which occurred.
4. It is submitted that since, no opportunity of hearing was given to the petitioner they could not bring to the notice of the authority

about the said discrepancy. Learned counsel submits that if an opportunity would have been given to the petitioner to approach the authorities, they could have easily with the help of documents substantiated the discrepancy therein.

5. Mr. Ashutosh Anand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the ESI submits that the substantial amount has already been recovered.

6. Considering the submission of the parties and especially considering Annexure-3 and the entries made in Annexure-3, which according to this Court reflects discrepancies, I direct the petitioner to approach the respondent No.2-The Regional Director, Employees State Insurance Corporation within three weeks from today.

7. Petitioner will put forth their case with supporting documents and if it is found that there was a genuine error occurred, the same should be rectified by the respondents.

8. Respondent no. 2 will consider the grievance of the petitioner and pass appropriate order based on the documents, which the petitioner will file in their support and also the documents maintained by the respondents.

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

(ANANDA SEN, J.)