

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No.654 of 2018

Satyadeo Mohan Ghosh Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.2984 of 2016

Naseem Ali & Others Petitioners
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.3027 of 2016

Ashok Kumar Roy & Others Petitioners
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.3031 of 2016

Pradip Kumar Gupta & Others Petitioners
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.5726 of 2017

Sanat Kumar Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.8 of 2018

Diploma Engineers Association, Jharkhand through its
General Secretary Shekhar Kumar... .. Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

With
W.P.(S) No.2189 of 2018

Shyam Das Singh Petitioner
Versus
The State of Jharkhand and Others... .. Respondents

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

For the Petitioners	: Mr. Jitendra Singh, Sr. Advocate
	: Ms. Amrita Sinha, Advocate
	: Mr. A.K.Sahani, Advocate
	: Mr. Yash Singh, Advocate
For the Resp-State	: Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, A.G.
	: Mr. Shray Mishra, AC to AG
For Res. No.6-JSEA	: Mr. Krishna Murari, Advocate
	: Mr. Ritesh Kr. Pathak, Advocate
	: Mr. Raj Vardhan, Advocate
For the J.P.S.C.	: Mr.Sanjay Piprawall, Advocate
	: Mr. Prince Kumar, Advocate
	: Mr. Rakesh Ranjan, Advocate
	: Mr. Jay Prakash, Advocate

Order No. 48/Dated 13th November, 2025

1. Reference be made to the order dated 13.10.2025 wherein this Court has criticized the State for not coming out with the final shape of the rule, as would be evident from paragraph 10 to 16, for ready reference, the same are being referred herein:-

“10. This is on the basis of the decision which is being taken on behalf of the State and the effect is that in absence of any Rule, the entire requirement/promotion came to stand still.

11. This Court fails to understand that how the State is functioning in absence of any specific Rule by denying the promotion to one or the other Engineers belonging to different cadres.

12. Today, four weeks’ time again has been sought for. The excuse has been given by the learned State counsel that it is for the purpose of getting approval in the different Departments, thereafter, it will be sent to the Cabinet.

13. This Court, in the aforesaid backdrop, is of the view that the State Government is not taking sincere endeavour inspite of the specific submission made to that effect by the learned Advocate General to bring the final Rule on record, as has been taken note in the order dated 15th September, 2025.

14. This Court, therefore, is of the view that the State for one reason or the other is delaying the matter reasons best known to the State.

15. This Court is further of the view that it is nothing, but the lethargic approach of the State. However, in the midst of proceeding, learned State counsel has got the telephonic instruction and as per the instruction received, the time has been sought for upto 06th November, 2025 for final approval of the Rule and to bring it on record by way of an affidavit.

16. This Court, before passing the further necessary order, is adjourning the matter by granting time upto 06th November, 2025, by way of last indulgence.”

2. Today, at 10:30 A.M., when the cases have been taken up, learned Advocate General has pressed one interlocutory application being I.A. No.15196 of 2025, wherein four weeks’ time has been sought for due to the reason that the Cabinet Secretariat and the Vigilance Department, State of Jharkhand, has made certain queries which need to be addressed.

3. This Court, taking into consideration the specific direction passed in the order dated 13.10.2025, has called upon the Secretary, Road Construction Department and the Secretary, Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha Department to explain the issue as to why the rule has not been framed.

4. The Secretary, Road Construction Department has stated before this Court that some mistake has been crept up in the file as has been pointed out before sending it to the Cabinet. Thereafter, again the file has been sent to the parent department, i.e., Road Construction Department,

and after rectification it is to be sent to the Personnel, Administrative Reforms and Rajbhasha Department and other departments, therefore, time has been sought for by filing interlocutory application.

5. However, objection has been made by learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner.

6. Since the State Government is in process and seeking time by way of last indulgence, as such, this Court is adjourning the matter to be listed after three weeks.

7. It is made clear that there will be no further adjournment on the ground which has been sought for in the last two occasions, as would be evident from the order dated 15th September, 2025 and 13th October, 2025.

8. This Court has already made observation in paragraphs 11 to 16 of the order dated 13.10.2025, particularly paragraphs 14 and 15 thereof, therefore, the same is not being repeated and the Court will proceed in pursuance to the order already passed on 13.10.2025.

9. List these cases on 04.12.2025.

10. Accordingly, I.A. No.15196 of 2025 stands disposed of.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

13th November, 2025

Birendra/