



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**L.P.A. No. 205 of 2009**

-----

Defence Estate Officer, Bihar & Orissa Circle, Danapur Cantonment,  
Patna, Bihar ... .. Appellant

Versus

Shobha Karnad & Ors. . ... .. Respondents

-----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUJIT NARAYAN PRASAD**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR RAI**

-----

|                           |                                     |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| For the Appellant         | :Mr. Mr. Prashant Pallav, A.S.G.I   |
|                           | :Mr. Sunil Kumar, C.G.S.C.          |
| For the Resp. No.1        | :Mr. Himanshu Kumar Mehta, Advocate |
|                           | :Mr. Rishav Raj, Advocate           |
|                           | :Ms. Manjusri Patra, Advocate       |
| For the Resp. No. 4       | : Mr. A.K. Das, Advocate            |
|                           | : Mr. Siddharth Jain, Advocate      |
| For the Resp. Nos.5 to 17 | : Mr. Apurb Lal, Advocate           |
|                           | : Mr. Vidhan Kumar Singh, Advocate  |
|                           | :Mr. Prabhakar Deo, Advocate        |

-----

**Order No.41/ Dated 24<sup>th</sup> November, 2025**

**I.A. No. 10865 of 2023**

1. The instant interlocutory application has been filed seeking leave for the appellant to place on record the documents annexed to this application.
2. The factual aspect as has been narrated in the instant interlocutory application reads as under:

*The case concerns 4.46 acres of land in M.S. Plot No. 557 at Morabadi, Ranchi, presently in the appellant's possession. The Enforcement Directorate began investigating illegal dealings related to this land and suspected money laundering, leading to the registration of ECIR No. 1/2023 pending before the Special Judge, PMLA, Ranchi. A sale deed dated 1 October 2021 was executed by Pradip Bagchi in favour of M/s Jagatbandhu Tea Estate Pvt. Ltd., showing a market value of ₹20.75 crore but a consideration of ₹7 crore. Investigation revealed that only ₹25 lakh was actually paid into Bagchi's account, and the remaining payments recorded in the deed were falsely shown.*

*Jayant Karnad claimed ownership as a descendant of B.M. Laxman Rao and B.M. Mukund Rao and received rent from the Defence authorities from 2008 onwards on this basis. He sold the land to 14 persons through 16*



*sale deeds for ₹2.55 crore. During investigation, ED recorded his statement, in which he admitted he had no documentary proof of ownership or succession – no Khatiyā, deed, mutation, rent receipts, or legal heir certificate. He stated that an advocate arranged documents, including an old probate order, which enabled him to obtain rent from Defence and later secure release of the land in 2009. Verification by Circle Officers and the District Record Room showed that the mutation entry cited by him (1298R27/60-61) was forged and impossible, as Shahar Anchāl did not exist during that period, and the original records were found tampered with. The Khatiyā for Plot No. 557 stands in the name of Pramod Nath Das Gupta, not B.M. Mukund Rao.*

*On 10 June 2023, the ED provisionally attached the land under Order No. 03/2023, covering both the land acquired by M/s Jagatbandhu Tea Estate Pvt. Ltd. and the land sold earlier by Jayant Karnad. On 8 November 2023, the Adjudicating Authority under PMLA confirmed this attachment, directing that it continue during the pendency of PMLA proceedings and become final upon confiscation under Section 8 of the Act.*

3. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has submitted that the documents, which are the part of the instant interlocutory application, are relevant for the adjudication of the issue. On the day the order was passed by the learned Writ Court, these documents were not available, as all the documents pertain to subsequent developments that occurred during the pendency of the instant Letters Patent Appeal.
4. An affidavit in opposition to the instant interlocutory application has been filed on behalf of the substituted respondent no. 1 and the intervener, who has been impleaded as respondent no. 4.
5. However, during the course of the arguments, learned counsel appearing for the concerned respondents, namely Mr. Himanshu Kumar Mehta and Mr. Apurb Lal, learned counsel have fairly agreed that the application may be disposed of for consideration of the documents in light of the provisions of Order 41, Rule 27(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure.
6. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant has submitted that the same may be considered in the light of 127(b) Code of Civil Procedure.



7. This Court, considering the aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the parties, is disposing of the instant interlocutory application for the consideration of the documents appended as part of the instant interlocutory application.
8. For its consideration in terms of the provision under Order 41, 27(b) of the Code of Civil Procedure, the instant interlocutory application being I.A. No. 10865 of 2023 stands disposed of.

**L.P.A. No. 205 of 2009**

9. Mr. Prashant Pallav, learned A.S.G.I., has submitted that he still needs more time to prepare and, as such, has sought an adjournment for today.
10. The aforesaid ground has not been objected by the learned counsel appearing for the respondents, including Mr. A.K. Das, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.4.
11. Accordingly, let this matter be listed on **02<sup>nd</sup> December, 2025**.

**(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)**

**(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)**