

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

LPA No. 450 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**

Versus

Hanuman Mal Surana & Ors. ... Respondents / Respondents

With

LPA No. 451 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**

Versus

Holy Cross Institute, Hazaribag,
through its President
Rosily Kolencherry & Ors. **Respondents / Respondents**

With

LPA No. 453 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**

Versus

Chittaranjan Das & Ors. ... Respondents / Respondents

With

LPA No. 454 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**

Versus

Prakash Kothari & Ors. Respondents / Respondents

With

LPA No. 455 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**

Versus

Santi Lal Lunkar & Ors. Respondents / Respondents

With

When
LPA No. 456 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari

Order No.09/ Dated 22nd November, 2023

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. In course of argument, learned counsel for the appellant SAIL Mr. Indrajit Sinha has sought for time to file certain documents which is the basis of the valuation of 112 properties at Bokaro for renewal of lease in pursuance of the policy decision taken by the appellant- SAIL.
3. Such occasion has arisen due to the point raised by the Respondents-writ petitioners referring to the clause 8.0(b)(i) wherein the appellant have taken a decision as per the said guidelines / policy decision for renewal of lease on applicable renewal charges equivalent to 25% of applicable land premium prevailing on the due date of renewal.
4. Further, reference has been made to the policy decision, as available at Annexure-2 appended to the valuation report wherein the reference of certain method which was used to arrive at a final adopted rate is there, one of which is the percentage increase annually in the guidelines rates of all the wards in Chas area during 2007-2013 was calculated.
5. It was also contended on behalf of the Respondent- writ petitioner by referring to the valuation chart, wherein, the details of the guidelines, based upon all the wards of Chas area is not available.
6. Mr. Indrajit Sinha, learned counsel for the appellant SAIL, in response, has submitted on instruction that the same although is not referred in the aforesaid valuation of 112 properties at Bokaro, as appended with the valuation report, but he is having the instruction that the said calculation is based upon the guidelines of all the wards, one of the factors as under appended to the Annexure-2. Therefore, he intends to bring the said details on record by filing additional affidavit.
7. This Court, on consideration of the aforesaid fact, is of the view that one opportunity is to be granted for coming to a rightful conclusion of the matter.

8. Accordingly, with the consent of the learned counsel for the parties, let the cases be posted on 29.11.2023 so that additional affidavit to be filed by the appellant, be filed on or before the next date of hearing.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Navneet Kumar, J.)