

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

F.A No.18 of 2025

Shailendra Kumar Singh **Appellant**
Versus
Smita Kumari and Anr. **Respondents**

With
F.A. No.253 of 2024

Smita Kumari **Appellant**
Versus
Shailendra Kumar Singh and Anr. **Respondents**

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

For the Appellant : Ms. Ashwani Priya, Advocate
(In F.A No.18 of 2025)
Mrs. Neeharika Mazumdar, Advocate
(In F.A No.253 of 2024)
For the Respondent : Ms. Ashwani Priya, Advocate
(In F.A No.253 of 2024)
Mrs. Neeharika Mazumdar, Advocate
(In F.A No.18 of 2025)

Order No.05/Dated: 14th October, 2025

1. We have perused the office notes in both the appeals.
2. Two different reports are there in both the appeals. In F.A. No. 18 of 2025 the reports pertaining to service of notice upon the respondent no.2 is that "notice has been returned unserved, since, the concerned respondent could not find at the mentioned address" while in F.A. No.253 of 2024 the office note, which is based upon the report of process server, reporting that "No such person residing at this address".
3. This Court, in view of the above, is of the view that the parties are to take steps for service of notice through substituted mode.
4. Let requisites etc. be filed within a week after reopening of 'Diwali' holidays.
5. Office to proceed accordingly.

6. Let an affidavit be filed showing the compliance of the said order in both the appeals.

(Sujit Narayan Prasad, J.)

(Arun Kumar Rai, J.)

Dated:14.10.2025
Sudhir