

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No.2659 of 2019

Pranit Kishore & Anr.

... .. **Petitioners**

Versus

Steel Authority of India Ltd. & Ors.

... .. **Respondents**

WITH

W.P.(C) No.1337 of 2018

WITH

W.P.(C) No.1429 of 2018

WITH

W.P.(C) No.1896 of 2018

WITH

W.P.(C) No.2513 of 2018

WITH

W.P.(C) No.2769 of 2018

WITH

W.P.(C) No.485 of 2019

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Kumar Harsh, Advocate
Mr. Rahul Lamba, Advocate
Mr. Aditya M. Khandelwal, Advocate
Ms. Kanu Priya, Advocate
Mr. Anish Kamal, Advocate
Ms. Neelam Kumari, Advocate

For the Respondent(s): Mr. Vishal Kr. Rai, AC to GA-IV
Mr. Bibhash Sinha, Advocate
Mrs. Prerna Jhunjhunwala, Advocate

10/ 09.07.2026

I.A. No.12095 of 2024 in W.P.(C) No.1337 of 2018

I.A. No.10829 of 2024 in W.P.(C) No.1429 of 2018

I.A. No.6470 of 2019 in W.P.(C) No.2513 of 2018

I.A. No.6471 of 2019 in W.P.(C) No.2769 of 2018

Heard.

2. These interlocutory applications in the respective writ petitions have been preferred on behalf of the petitioners for amendment.

3. The petitioners had preferred these writ petitions challenging the premium which the respondents have demanded for

renewal of lease / fresh lease at an enhanced rate. As per them, the enhancement is more than 400 times.

4. For the first time in the counter affidavit, the respondent – Steel Authority of India Limited (SAIL), has produced a Board's Resolution by way of a Policy Decision in respect of renewal of lease.

5. Learned counsel representing the respondent – State admits that there is a Board's Resolution and the respondent – SAIL acted pursuant to the Board's Resolution involving Policy Decision.

6. Learned counsel representing the petitioners submits that the Board's Resolution needs to be challenged, thus this interlocutory application has been filed for amending the writ petition.

7. Considering the submission of the parties, it appears that no prejudice will be caused to the respondents if the amendment application is allowed. Further, in a similar set of writ petition, the same Board Resolution was also allowed to be challenged by way of amendment in L.P.A. No.21 of 2017. Further, in one of these writ petitions listed today being W.P.(C) No.485 of 2019, involving the same issue, similar amendment had also been allowed.

8. Considering the aforesaid, these interlocutory applications for amendment are also **allowed**.

9. The petitioners are directed to file amended writ petitions incorporating the proposed amendment in similar manner as sought for in these interlocutory applications. The petitioners will also serve a copy of the amended writ petition upon the respondent – SAIL, who is at liberty to file an additional counter affidavit.

10. After such incorporation, office is directed to scan the

amended petitions afresh.

I.A. No. 6472 of 2019 in W.P.(C) No.1337 of 2018

I.A. No. 6473 of 2019 in W.P.(C) No.1429 of 2018

11. Learned counsel representing the petitioners do not want to press these interlocutory applications.

12. In view of the aforesaid submission, these interlocutory applications are dismissed as not pressed.

W.P.(C) Nos.2659 of 2019, 1337 of 2018, 1429 of 2018, 1896 of 2018, 2513 of 2018, 2769 of 2018 and 485 of 2019

13. List these cases after eight weeks.

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

09th July, 2026
Prashant. Cp-2