

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
First Appeal No.233 of 2023

Dipti Sharma

....

Appellant

Versus

Gunjan Sharma

.....

Respondent

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

For the Appellant

: Ms. Oishi Das, Advocate

For the Respondent

:

16/Dated: 24.11.2025

1. It is a case where we have sought for explanation from the office in terms of order dated 17th November, 2025.
2. The explanation has been furnished jointly signed by Section Officer, First Appeal Section and Dealing Assistant, First Appeal Section dated 22.11.2025
3. It has been explained by them that notice under Order V Rule 20 for paper publication has been filed before centralized filing section on 31.10.2025. It has further been stated therein that the office came to know about the approved draft of notice under Order V Rule 20 which was to be provided to the learned counsel for the petitioner, had not been handed over to him for the paper publication and also, it was not available with the file as the same draft notice has inadvertently been misplaced.
4. It has also been explained that upon hectic search, the same was inadvertently kept with another filing. Immediately thereafter duly filled, signed and sealed draft of notice has been handed over to

the Advocate Clerk of the concerned learned Advocate for paper publication on 14.11.2025.

5. This Court has found from the said explanation that the notice was received in First Appeal Section on 03.11.2025 but in searching out the said document, it has been taken 11 days.
6. The explanation has been furnished jointly by the Section Officer and the Dealing Assistant but there is no explanation furnished by the Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar, in-charge of the concerned Section.
7. The High Court is having the set-up to be monitored by the Assistant Registrar of each Section and above than the Assistant Registrar, there is Deputy Registrar also.
8. The explanation so furnished jointly by the Section Officer and Dealing Assistant dated 22.11.2025, thus reflects, that there is monitoring either by the Assistant Registrar or the Deputy Registrar, being the in-charge of the concerned Section.
9. Let an explanation be asked from the Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar of the concerned Section as to why such lapses have been committed and why it has not been come to the notice of the Assistant Registrar and Deputy Registrar of the concerned Section.
10. If the Assistant Registrar or the Deputy Registrar would have monitored the thing day to day basis, then, it would have been pointed out about the lapse of 11 days' time. In a litigation, time is

priceless and there cannot be lapses causing hindrance in the dispensation of justice.

11. This Court, *prima-facie*, is of the view as per the report dated 22.11.2025 that there is no monitoring either by the Assistant Registrar or the Deputy Registrar, being the in-charge of the concerned Section.
12. Learned Registrar General is directed to call for an explanation from the Assistant Registrar and the Deputy Registrar of the concerned Section to explain as to why such lapses have been committed and if committed as per explanation, then what follow up action, has been taken by them.
13. Let this matter be listed on 01.12.2025 along with the explanation so that the further necessary order be passed.
14. Office is directed to proceed further without waiting for the explanation which is required to be furnished as referred hereinabove so that there may not be any further delay in the matter of issuance of notice for securing appearance of the respondent.
15. Office is to do needful immediately.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

24.11.2025
Rohit/-