

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Civil Review No.11 of 2021

Steel Authority of India Limited & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Sada Nand Singh
... .. **Respondent**

With
Civil Review No.44 of 2021

Steel Authority of India Limited & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Arvind Kumar & Another
... .. **Respondents**

With
Civil Review No.46 of 2021

Union of India & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Surendra Kumar Ishwar & Others
... .. **Respondents**

With
Civil Review No.47 of 2021

Steel Authority of India Limited & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Arvind Kumar and another
... .. **Respondents**

With
Civil Review No.49 of 2021

Union of India & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Prem Kumar Lohani & Others
... .. **Respondents**

With
Civil Review No.50 of 2021

Union of India & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Someshwar Tiwari & Another
... .. **Respondents**

With
Civil Review No.51 of 2021

Union of India & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Ishwar Dutta Upadhyay
... .. **Respondent**

With
Civil Review No.62 of 2021

Steel Authority of India Limited & Others
... .. **Petitioners**

Virendra Pratap Singh Versus **Respondent**
With
Cont. Case (Civil) No.215 of 2021

Bachcha Devi **Petitioner**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand & Another **Opp. Parties**
With
Cont. Case (Civil) No.486 of 2021

Sunil Kumar & Another **Petitioners**
Versus
The State of Jharkhand & Others **Opp. Parties**
With
Cont. Case (Civil) No.426 of 2022

Shiv Shankar Jha ... **Petitioner**
Versus
Bhupendra Singh Popli, Chief General Manager (Town &
Administration), Bokaro Steel Plant & Another
... **Opp. Parties**

**CORAM :HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP KUMAR SRIVASTAVA**

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate Mr. Bibhash Sinha, Advocate Mr. Amitabh Prasad, Advocate [in all Civil Reviews]
	: Mr. Manoj Tandon, Advocate Mr. Adamya Kerketta, Advocate Ms. Ankita, Advocate [In Con. 486/2021 & 426/2022]
For the Respondents	: Mr. Manoj Tandon, Advocate Mr. Adamya Kerketta, Advocate Ms. Ankita, Advocate [C.Rev. Nos 46 & 49/2021]
	: Mr. Afaqur Rashidi, Advocate Ms. Aulia Begum, Advocate [Resp. Nos.4 in 46/2021]
	: Mr. Kumar Harsh, Advocate [In C.Rev. No.47 & 49/2021]
	: Mr. Diwakar Jha, Advocate
	: Mr. Bharat Kumar, Advocate [Resp. Nos.20 in 49/2021]
	: Md. Nasim Akhtar, Advocate [Resp. Nos.17 in 49/2021]
	: Mr. Rajiv Kumar Karan, Advocate Mr. Bhola Nath Ojha, Advocate [In C.Rev. 49/2021 & 51/2021]
	: Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate

Mr. Bibhash Sinha, Advocate
Mr. Amitabh Prasad, Advocate
[In Cont. 215 & 486/20221 & 426/2022]
: Ms. Priti Priyamvada, AC to GP-V
[In Cont. 215/2021]
: Mr. Rajesh Kr. Singh, AC to SC (L&C)-II
[In Cont. 486/2021]
Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, AC to GA-I
[In Cont. 426/2022]

Order No.09 : Dated 28th February, 2024

I.A. No.3182 of 2021 in Civil Review No.11 of 2021

1. The instant interlocutory application has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of 344 days delay in filing the present review petition.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. Having regard to the averments made in this application, we are of the view that the petitioner was prevented by sufficient cause from preferring review within the period of limitation.
4. Accordingly, I.A. No.3182 of 2021 is allowed and the delay in preferring review petition is condoned.

I.A. No.380 of 2022 in Civil Review No.46 of 2021, I.A. No.381 of 2022 in Civil Review No.49 of 2021, I.A. No.385 of 2022 in Civil Review No.50 of 2021 and I.A. No.382 of 2022 in Civil Review No.51 of 2021

5. The instant interlocutory application has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of 24 days delay in filing the present review petitions.
6. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
7. Having regard to the averments made in this application, we are of the view that the petitioner was

prevented by sufficient cause from preferring review within the period of limitation.

8. Accordingly, I.A. No.380 of 2022, I.A. No.381 of 2022, I.A. No.385 of 2022 and 382 of 2022 are allowed and the delay in preferring review petitions is hereby condoned.

I.A. No.2979 of 2022 in Civil Review No.62 of 2021

9. The instant interlocutory application has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of 57 days delay in filing the present review petition.

10. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

11. Having regard to the averments made in this application, we are of the view that the petitioner was prevented by sufficient cause from preferring review within the period of limitation.

12. Accordingly, I.A. No.2979 of 2022 is allowed and the delay in preferring review petition is hereby condoned.

Civil Review No.11 of 2021 & analogous matters

13. Post these matters on 11.03.2024 for further hearing in the matter.

14. In the meanwhile, if the review petitioners want to bring on record any additional document, the same be brought on record, i.e., allotment letters etc., by way of a common affidavit.

15. Mr. Rajiv Kumar Karn, learned counsel who is appearing for the Respondent No.10 in Civil Review No.49 of 2021, has

submitted that he has already been paid an amount of Rs.4,34,171/- inclusive of statutory interest.

16. The review petitioners should also come with the details of the basis of calculation to assess the amount which has been paid to Respondent No.10 to the tune of Rs.4,34,171/- giving in the tabular chart.

17. Let these matters be posted on 11.03.2024.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Pradeep Kumar Srivastava, J.)

Birendra/