

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

L.P.A. No. 332 of 2025

Amrita Ray & Others

..... Appellants

Versus

The State of Jharkhand & Others

..... Respondents

CORAM

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Appellants:

Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate

For the State:

Mr. Suraj Prakash, A.C. to S.C.-VII

03/09.03.2026

I.A. No. 7340 of 2025:

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. This interlocutory application seeks condonation of delay of 1107 days in instituting this appeal. Although the delay appears to be inordinate, given the explanation furnished, we are satisfied that there is sufficient cause to condone the delay. In such matters, the length of the delay is only one of the considerations, however, the most crucial consideration is the quality of the explanation.
3. This appeal challenges the learned Single Judge's order dated 02.05.2022 passed in W.P. (S) No. 736 of 2010. Within a month from the pronouncement of the impugned order, the petitioners instituted a review petition which was within the prescribed period of limitation. The review petition was ultimately dismissed on 21.03.2025.
4. Against the said order, perhaps on legal advice, the appellants/applicants preferred a letters patent appeal. Upon realising that the said L.P.A. was not maintainable, the same was withdrawn on 11.06.2025 with liberty to prefer an L.P.A. challenging the provisional order dated 02.05.2022. Pursuant to the said liberty, this L.P.A. was instituted most expeditiously i.e., on 17.06.2025.

5. From the above sequence of events, it is apparent that the appellants/applicants were not indolent, but were agitating their grievance with regard to the impugned order dated 02.05.2022 by pursuing the review petition and the L.P.A. Besides, learned counsel for the appellants/applicants has relied upon the Division Bench's order dated 05.01.2023 passed in L.P.A. No. 254 of 2022 to submit that one of the co-petitioners, who chose not to institute a review petition, but to file an L.P.A. against the learned Single Judge's order dated 02.05.2022, has succeeded in such appeal.
6. Though learned counsel for the respondents has argued that the order dated 05.01.2023 passed in L.P.A. No. 254 of 2022 is distinguishable, we are satisfied that even after excluding the impact of the order dated 05.01.2023, sufficient causes have been made out for condonation of the delay. The impact of the order dated 05.01.2023 can be considered at the stage of consideration of the present appeal.
7. For the above reasons, we condone the delay in filing the present appeal.
8. The present interlocutory application stands disposed of.

L.P.A. No. 332 of 2025:

9. List this matter under the heading "**For Admission**" on 23.03.2026 high on board.
10. Learned counsel for the respondents must consider and obtain instructions with regard to the order dated 05.01.2023 disposing of L.P.A. No. 254 of 2022, which was instituted by one of the co-petitioners against the impugned order dated 02.05.2022 passed in W.P. (S) No. 736 of 2010.

11. Liberty is granted to the respondents to file counter affidavit after serving a copy of the same on learned counsel for the appellants latest by 20.03.2026.

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

(RAJESH SHANKAR, J.)

09.03.2026
Satish/Vikas/