

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 985 of 2023
with
I.A. No. 4031 of 2025

Jorong Surin & Ors.	...	...	Petitioners
Versus			
The State of Jharkhand and Anr.	...	...	Opp. Parties

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners : Mr. Binod Singh, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Shray Mishra, AC to AG

07/28.03.2025

The learned counsel for the parties are present.

2. Learned counsel for the opposite parties has submitted that this interlocutory application has been filed seeking exemption from payment of cost imposed by this Court vide order dated 14.02.2025.

3. Learned counsel for the opposite parties has referred to para-5 of the interlocutory application and submits that order dated 25.04.2023, passed in W.P.(S). No. 1546 of 2023 was already complied by passing order dated 01.10.2024 and thereafter, the matter was reconsidered and a fresh order dated 26.03.2025 has been passed. Learned counsel for the opposite parties has submitted that the occasion to reconsider arose in view of order dated 29.11.2024. The learned counsel has submitted that in view of the interlocutory application the opposite parties be exempted from depositing the fine imposed by this Court vide order dated 14.02.2025.

4. The order dated 29.11.2024 reveals that the reasoned order dated 01.10.2024 was taken into consideration and when the counsel for the petitioner pointed-out that in reasoned order reference to order made in L.P.A. No. 218 of 2015 was made, wherein the petitioners were not even the parties, the learned counsel for the opposite parties prayed for time to file supplementary affidavit. The matter was directed to be posted on 07.02.2025.

5. A show-cause was filed on 10.02.2025, merely indicating that in the writ order no direction was issued to the respondent No. 4-Deputy Commissioner to comply the order and the petitioners were directed to

file representation before the respondent No. 2-Inspector General of Registration.

6. An interlocutory application being I.A. No. 1985 of 2025 was filed seeking extension of time to comply the order dated 29.11.2024. However, there was no explanation as to what steps were taken from 29.11.2024 to 16.01.2025 but the matter was adjourned subject to payment of Rs.10,000/- to the petitioner .

7. In the interlocutory application being I.A. No. 4031 of 2025, the petition seeking exemption from paying the cost, nothing has been mentioned as to what the opposite parties had done after the order dated 29.11.2024. It has only been mentioned that the order was complied on 01.10.2024 and fresh order was passed on 26.03.2025. The order dated 29.11.2024 itself reveals that on being pointed-out by the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners with respect to the reasoned order dated 01.10.2024, the counsel for the opposite parties themselves prayed for time to the supplementary affidavit.

8. Considering the reason for imposition of cost vide order dated 14.02.2025, this Court is not inclined to exempt the opposite party No.2 from paying the cost.

9. For the aforesaid reasons, the I.A. No. 4031 of 2025 is hereby rejected.

10. At this, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that still order of this Court has not been complied in true letter and spirit. He seeks time to respond to the reasoned order as contained in memo No. 499 dated 26.03.2025.

11. The counsel for the opposite parties submits that the cost as imposed by order dated 14.02.2025 will be paid within a period of two weeks.

12. Post this case on 09.05.2025.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Kunal/-