

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**

C.M.P. No. 518 of 2026

M/s Sulej Constructions Limited, Chandigarh, Punjab, through its Director, Shri Susil Kumar Rana, S/o Shri Janak Singh Rana, R/o 23, ATS Vally School, ATS Golf Meadows 4, Derabassi, P.O.-Derabassi, P.S.-Derabassi, District-SAS Nagar (Mohali)

..... Petitioner

Versus

1. Tenughat Vidyut Nigam Limited, through its Chairman, Ranchi
2. General Manager-cum-Chief Engineer, Tenughat Thermal Power Station, Lalpania, Bokaro
3. Superintending Engineer (Civil-I), Tenughat Thermal Power Station, Lalpania, Bokaro
4. Superintending Engineer (Civil-II), Tenughat Thermal Power Station, Lalpania, Bokaro

..... Respondents

-----

**CORAM**

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**

-----

For the Petitioner: Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate

Mr. Arpan Mishra, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr. Shahbaj Akhtar, Advocate

-----

02/16.06.2026

1. Heard Mr. Indrajit Sinha, who appears along with Mr. Arpan Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Shahbaj Akhtar, learned counsel for the respondents.
2. Mr. Shahbaj Akhtar submits that he has instruction to appear and file Vakalatnama on behalf of the respondents within the course of the day.
3. The Registry to accept the Vakalatnama.
4. The petitioner, by invoking Article 227 of the Constitution, seeks a direction to the Commercial Court, Ranchi to dispose of Commercial (Suit) Case No. 25 of 2005 (Original Civil Suit No. 448 of 1995) expeditiously.
5. Normally, this Court is loathe to issue directions for time bound disposal of suits. This is because this Court does not have any statistics about pendency etc. Still, this is a suit which was

originally instituted in the year 1995 and was subsequently renumbered as Commercial (Suit) Case No. 25 of 2005.

6. The order sheet produced on record discloses that final arguments commenced sometime in March, 2019 and till date, despite expiry of almost seven years, the arguments have not been concluded. True, in between, the lawyers restrained from attending the Court on account of strikes and the judicial officers were also deputed to West Bengal for the Special Intensive Revision of Electoral Rolls. However, even if such periods or the dates, on which adjournments were granted for legitimate reasons, are excluded, still, we think that commercial suit originally instituted in the year 1995 should have been disposed of finally.
7. Accordingly, we direct the Commercial Court to dispose of Commercial (Suit) Case No. 25 of 2005 as expeditiously as possible and in any event, within four months from the date of filing of an authenticated copy of this order by the parties.
8. The advocates appearing in the matter must cooperate with the Court as well as with the learned Judge so that this direction can be complied with. No unnecessary adjournments must be sought and if sought, the same, should not be ordinarily granted.
9. The present C.M.P. is accordingly disposed of with the above direction and observation without any order for costs.

**(M. S. SONAK, C.J.)**

**(RAJESH SHANKAR, J.)**