

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 7750 of 2025

M/s. Vaskar Construction through its proprietor Subhash Chandra
Jha, Bokaro Petitioner

Versus

The Steel Authority of India Limited through the Chairman, Steel
Authority of India Limited, New Delhi & Ors. ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Dr. (Mrs.) Vandana Singh, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Shresth Gautam, Advocate

Order No. 02

Dated: 21.01.2026

Heard Dr. (Mrs.) Vandana Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Shresth Gautam, learned counsel for the
respondents.

2. This petition challenges the banning order dated
29.01.2025 and the appeal dismissal order dated 04.11.2025, in
terms of which, the petitioner has been banned for two years to
undertake any business with the respondent – Steel Authority of
India Limited (SAIL).

3. The impugned order refers to multiple instances of
defaults on the part of the petitioner in paragraph nos. 7(c) and
8(a) of the appeal dismissal order.

4. Mrs. Singh states that the said finding is entirely
incorrect and apart from two defaults, there was no further default
on the part of the petitioner.

5. Accordingly, we direct the respondent – SAIL to file an
affidavit and place on record the instances of multiple defaults
referred to in the appeal dismissal order. Besides, the SAIL may also
place on record a copy of the show cause notice and the

petitioner's reply to the same along with their affidavit. In addition, the SAIL is at liberty to file other documents as well.

6. Such affidavit should be filed by the respondent – SAIL by 13.02.2026 after giving an advance copy to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

7. List this matter on 17.02.2026.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioner seeks stay in the meanwhile. In this case, we are concerned with some mere breach of the contractual terms. The allegation against the petitioner is of multiple breaches and that too, in the matter of payment of workers' dues. When it comes to workers' dues, the same have to be paid punctually because the difficulties they face are almost invariably severe. The record prima facie shows that on account of the petitioner's delay and defaults, the SAIL had to pay the workers' dues to mitigate their hardships.

9. In such circumstances, we are not inclined to grant any interim relief in this matter. These are only prima facie observations and we will remember to ignore them once the pleadings are complete and the matter is further heard.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)