

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**  
**L.P.A. No.483 of 2025**  
**With**  
**I.A. No.9480 of 2025**

-----

1. The State of Jharkhand through its Secretary, Road Construction Department, Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O.-Dhurwa, P.S.-Jagannathpur, District-Ranchi-834004.
2. Engineer-in-Chief, Road Construction Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O.-Dhurwa, P.S. Jagannathpur, District-Ranchi-834004.
3. Chief Engineer (Communication), Road Construction Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, P.O.-Dhurwa. P.S.-Jagannathpur, District-Ranchi-834004
4. Executive Engineer, Road Construction Department, Road Division, Seraikella-Kharsawan, P.O.-Seraikella, P.S.-Seraikela, District-Kharsawan.

..... Appellants.

-Versus-

Mandeepa Enterprises (a proprietorship firm having its office at Unit G-1, Tulip Garden Dashodron, Rajarhat, Main Road, Opposite State Bank of India, Kolkata-7000136 through its proprietor namely, Madan Satya Das, son of Late Satya Girish Das, resident of Tulip Garden, Dashodron, Rajarhat, Main Road, Opposite State Bank of India, P.O. & P.S.-Rajarhat, District-Kolkata-700136 (West Bengal).

..... Respondent.

-----

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

-----

For the Appellants :       Mr. Aditya Kumar, AC to Sr. SC-I  
For the Respondent:       Mr. Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate  
  Ms. Shruti Shekhar, Advocate

-----

**Order No.02**

**Date: 07.07.2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. In identical circumstances, we dismissed similar I.As. in L.P.A. Nos.386 & 560 of 2025 seeking condonation of delay of 275 days.
3. It is pointed out that even this appeal seeks to challenge the judgment and order dated 8<sup>th</sup> May, 2024 in W.P.(C) No.5591 of 2023. Incidentally, on the same date, W.P.(C) Nos.5604 & 5605 of 2023 were also disposed of from which L.P.A. Nos.386 & 560

of 2025 had been filed after delay of 275 days. In fact, all these petitions were connected though disposed of by separate orders.

4. The cause shown in this I.A. is not different from the cause shown in the I.As. filed in L.P.A. Nos.386 & 560 of 2025. Therefore, by adopting our reasoning in the order dated 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2025 disposing of I.As. in the said two L.P.As., we dismiss this I.A. as well.
5. Even otherwise, we are satisfied that no sufficient cause has been shown except for reference to routine bureaucratic delays by moving the files from one table to the other and from one officer to another.
6. I.A. No.9480 of 2025 is, accordingly, dismissed without any order for costs.
7. Consequently, the accompanying appeal or any other I.As. therein will not survive and are disposed of.

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

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

*7<sup>th</sup> July, 2026*  
*Sanjay/AKT*  
*Uploaded on 08.07.2026*