

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cont. Case (Civil) No. 387 of 2026

Vijeta Projects and Infrastructure Ltd., Ranchi.

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand & Others

.... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner: Mr Sudhanshu Kumar Singh, Advocate
Ms Chainika, Advocate
For the State: Mr Piyush Chitresh, AC to AG
For the O.P. Nos. 2 & 3: Mr Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate
Mr Ranjeet Kushwaha, Advocate

Order No. 03 / Dated: 21.04.2026

1. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
2. Mr Arava Rajkamal, Managing Director and Mr Sunil Kumar, Executive Engineer of JSBCCL, Ranchi are present in the Court.
3. The Managing Director has filed an affidavit. In paragraph-5, there is an undertaking to comply with the order dated 26.02.2026 passed in W.P.(C) No. 1867 of 2025 *“in its letters and spirit and to disburse the payment pertaining to price variation in favour of petitioner”*.
4. After that, certain difficulties are cited on account of an order for freezing of JSBCCL's account in an unconnected matter. Based on such subsequent difficulties, we do not think that the contemnors can legitimately seek any indulgence from this Court.
5. In terms of the order dated 26.02.2026 passed in W.P.(C) No. 1867 of 2025, there was a statement that payments would be made on or before

25th of March, 2026. Apart from the statement, this Court had issued a specific direction to make payment on or before the 25th of March, 2026.

6. Today's affidavit does not explain why the payment was not made on or before the 25th of March 2026, though this contempt petition alleges the willful disobedience of the order dated 26.02.2026. At that time, admittedly, the difficulties now cited were not available.

7. To avoid compliance, a petition was filed seeking review of the order dated 26.02.2026. This review petition was filed on the 23rd of March, 2026, i.e., only two days before the payment deadline. Mere filing of a review petition does not operate as a stay, and therefore, some explanation was due for the non-compliance with our order dated 26.02.2026. The review petition, it appears, was filed only to avoid payment in defiance of the directions contained in our order dated 26.02.2026. In any event, the review petition was dismissed on the 9th of April 2026.

8. In the review petition, the JSBCCL had made a statement that since it is the instrumentality of the State, it is ready and willing to honor the offer of giving price variation and pay the price variation amount to the petitioner at the earliest, *“provided that the writ petitioner honors the offer in its totality and does not pursue its claim for refund of GST / differential amount of GST”*.

9. The above statement in effect amounted to “arm-twisting.” In any event, the JSBCCL expressed readiness and willingness to pay the price variation amount at the earliest, but despite the order of this Court, chose to suggest some condition subject to which the payment would be made at the

earliest. This is relevant when considering whether the conduct of those in charge of governing this Corporation is prima facie contumacious.

10. Now, it is submitted by those present in Court that a decision has been taken to pay, but no statement is forthcoming regarding the timeline.

11. Accordingly, only to give the contemnors an additional opportunity, we post this matter on the 30th of April 2026, high on board to report compliance.

12. If the payments are not made on or before the next date, the contemnors shall remain present in the Court on the next date. If the payments are made, the contemnors are not required to be present in Court on the next date.

13. Stand over to 30th of April 2026, high on board.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

April 21, 2026

Ranjeet/R.Kr.

Uploaded on 23.04.2026