

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
L.P.A. No. 596 of 2024

Pradeep Oraon and others	---	---	Appellants
Versus			
Jagarnath Prajapati and others	---	---	Respondents

CORAM: **Hon'ble The Chief Justice**
 Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Shankar

For the Appellants:	Mr. Harendra Kr. Mahato, Advocate
	Mrs. Ahalya Mahato, Advocate
	Ms. Jyotsna Mahato, Advocate
For the Pvt. Respondents:	Mr. Shashank Shekhar, Advocate
For the Resp.-State:	Mr. Ashwini Bhushan, A.C to Sr. S.C-II

I.A. No. 12580 of 2024

09 / 20.01.2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. This interim application seeks condonation of delay of 140 days in filing the appeal. Learned counsel for the Respondents points out that along with this appeal, no application was filed for condonation of delay. However, it is only after the Registry pointed out the defect, such application was filed. He, therefore, submits that the appeal was properly constituted only after filing the application for condonation of delay. The delay now, according to him, would be 218 days and not 140 days.

3. Considering this objection, appellants were granted liberty to file additional affidavit, which has been filed by the appellants.

4. The appellants have explained that they received the impugned order at onset of vacation. They were under the bonafide impression that no appeal could be filed during this period and therefore, they discussed amongst themselves and soon after the conclusion of the vacation, approached an Advocate to prepare and file the appeal.

5. After the Registry pointed out that the appeal was not accompanied by any application for condoning the delay of 140 days, such application was also

2.

filed. They have referred to the practice of the office pointing out the objections and granting sometime to the parties to clear such objection.

6. Upon considering the cause shown and the fact that the appellants are agriculturist, we do not think that any malafides are involved or that the appellants have drawn undue mileage on account of delay. The cause shown appears to be genuine and sufficient. The appellants entrusted the matter to their Advocate and were perhaps confident that necessary procedures would be complied with. There is no lack of diligence as such reflected from the record or conduct of the appellants. The delay is also not inordinate and in any event, the cause shown is sufficient.

7. Therefore, for all the above reasons, we condone the delay, without going into the issue as to whether such delay is of 140 days or 218 days. Even in respect of the delay of 218 days, sufficient cause has been shown through the additional affidavit which the appellants have filed. This I.A. is accordingly disposed of, by condoning the delay.

L.P.A. No. 596 of 2024

8. The appeal should now be placed 'For Admission' on 18th of February, 2026.

(M.S. Sonak, C.J)

(Rajesh Shankar, J)

January 20, 2026

Ranjeet/R. Kr.
Uploaded on
21.01.2026