

ITEM NO.9

COURT NO.5

SECTION XVII-B

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 (C) No(s). 967/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 18-10-2023 in LPA No. 231/2021 passed by the High Court of Jharkhand at Ranchi]

CHANDAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF JHARKHAND & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 1338/2024 (XVII-B)

SLP(C) No. 1309/2024 (XVII-B)

SLP(C) No. 1310/2024 (XVII-B)

SLP(C) No. 15582/2024 (XVII-B)

Date : 02-12-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Anup Kumar, AOR
Ms. Gauri Subramaniam, Adv.
Mrs. Shruti Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Neha Jaiswal, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Abhisek Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Vartika Vaishnavi, Adv.

Mr. Kumar Shivam, AOR

Mr. Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sahil Bhalaik, AOR
Mr. Amritansh Vats, Adv.
Mr. Tushar Giri, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Anil Khanna, Adv.
Mr. Ritik Arora, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Pradyut kashyap, Adv.
Mr. Shourya Dasgupta, Adv.
Ms. Gulshan Jahan, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Sudhir Bisla, Adv.
 Ms. Madhusmita Bora, AOR
 Mr. Honey Khanna, Adv.
 Mr. Riju Raj Singh Jamwal, Adv.
 Mrs. Sumitra Bisla, Adv.
 Mr. Thanay Manohar, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, AOR
 Mr. Parth Shekhar, Adv.
 Mr. Youkteshwari Prasad, Adv.
 Mr. Somyadeep Chatterjee, Adv.
 Mr. Darshan Chandrakant Siddarkar, Adv.
 Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Adv.
 Mr. Mayur Raj, Adv.
 Mr. Nikhil Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Shubham Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Adv.
 Mr. Dhruv Raman Singh, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Agrawal, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Rachitta Rai, AOR
 Mr. Ashutosh Prasad Joshi, Adv.
 Mr. Samresh Chandra Jha, Adv.
 Ms. Aditi, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Bhatnagar, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Saaket Jain, Adv.
 Ms. Shivangi Anand, Adv.
 Mr. Aaditya Sidra, Adv.
 Mr. Aditya Sidra, Adv.
 Mr. Siddhartha Iyer, AOR

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

Prima facie, we are of the view that the order impugned passed by the Division Bench of the High Court requires to be interfered with.

However, we are inclined to adjourn these matters by two weeks so as to enable the learned counsel for the State to verify as to whether there are similarly placed persons who have already filed writ petitions before the High Court which are pending.

The official respondent can also find out as to whether

the similarly placed persons who are aggrieved by Clause 8 of the advertisement can be accommodated in their respective categories, which they are otherwise entitled to.

List the matters after two weeks.

(SWETA BALODI)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR