

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No(s).6992/2014

(From the judgement and order dated 19/10/2013 in WPPIL No.2514/2011 of The HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI)

RAMESH KUMAR RAHI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF JHARKHAND & ORS

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and prayer for interim relief and office report)

Date: 24/03/2014 This Petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S. RADHAKRISHNAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAMAJIT SEN

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Subhro Sanyal,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. G.E. Vahanwati,AG
Mr. R.S. Mazumdar,Adv.
Mr. Ajit Kumar Sinha,Adv.
Mr. Tapesk Kumar Singh,Adv.
Mr. Mohd. Waquas,Adv.
Mr. Devadatt Kamat,Adv.
Ms. Sania Husaini,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Attorney General for India.

Learned counsel for the petitioner referred to Annexure-P1 and submitted that the permission was granted by the Deputy Commissioner, Dhanbad under Section 46-B of the Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act, for entering into transactions referred in pages D to F in the SLP, without properly ascertaining whether the parties are hailing from the District in question. Further, it was also pointed out that the land in question is Tribal Land, which can be transferred only between the persons who are residing within the District that too only among Tribals.

Let a proper affidavit be filed by the Deputy Commissioner, within two weeks, explaining those transactions and also clarify whether the vendor and vendee belong to the District in question or not.

Post after two weeks.

The order regarding cost, imposed by the High Court, shall stand suspended for the time being.

| (Narendra Prasad)
| Court Master

| | (Renuka Sadana)
| Court Master |