

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

LPA No. 456 of 2022

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

General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**
Versus
M/s. Modern Ice Manufacturing and
air conditioning Company & Ors. ... **Respondents / Respondents**

With
LPA No. 457 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**
Versus
Dr. Santosh Kumar Banerjee & Ors. ... **Respondents / Respondents**

With
LPA No. 458 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**
Versus
Varun Chadda
@ Varun Kumar Chadda & Ors. ... **Respondents / Respondents**

With
LPA No. 460 of 2022

Steel Authority of India Limited
through its Chairman represented through
John Tapan Kongari
General Manager (Law)
SAIL, Bokaro Appellant / **Petitioner**
Versus
Birendra Kumar Agrawal & Ors. ... **Respondents / Respondents**

.....

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

For the Appellants : Mr. Indrajit Sinha, Advocate
: Mr. Bibhash Sinha, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Rahul Kumar Gupta, Advocate
: Mr. Rahul Lamba, Advocate
: Mr. Aditya Mohan Khandelwal
: Mr. Peter Martin T.J., Advocate
: Mr. K.M. Joseph, Advocate

Order No.11/ Dated 20th December, 2023

1. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant mainly on the calculation chart as available at page 91 of the supplementary affidavit filed by the appellant on 28.11.2023.
2. The justification has been given regarding the calculation as available therein i.e., at Annexure-4 pertaining to "Government

Guidelines Rates per decimal for Commercial Plots- Main Road”, which has been assessed by taking average of 6, which comes to 14.1667. The same is based upon the difference of the enhancement of the rate as per Government notification from the year 2007 - 2008, 2008 - 2009, 2009 - 2010, 2010 - 2011, 2011 – 2012 and 2012-2013.

3. It has been submitted that so far as the enhancement of rate from 2007-2008, 2008-2009, 2009-2010 is concerned, the majority of the rates of enhancement has been taken into consideration, which is 14, 25, 9 respectively for the year 2007-2008, 2008-2009 and 2009-2010. But the differential rate for the year 2010-2011 has been shown to be 37, which has been assessed by way of enhancement in the rate of the land as per the government notification from 2010-2011.

4. This Court has put a pointed query upon learned counsel for the appellant as to why 37 has been taken as the average for the year 2010-2011 while for the other years the majority of the enhanced rate has been taken into consideration, since, for the year 2010-2011 the majority of rate of the area has been shown to be zero, meaning thereby, that there was no enhancement in the rate of rent for the year 2010-2011.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant has sought for time to explain the same.

6. As prayed for, list this case on 04.01.2024.

7. In the meantime, learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that defect as pointed out in L.P.A. No. 457 of 2022 will also be removed.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Navneet Kumar, J.)