

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P. (C) No. 3494 of 2010

Kohinoor Steel Private Limited, having its unit at Bunlandih, Chandil an existing company incorporated under the provision of Companies Act, 1956 having its local office at 326, Ashiana Trade Centre, Adityapur, Jamshedpur through its Manager Corporate Affairs Sri Prabir Ghosh, son of Late Jaydev Ghosh, resident of 16A, Everest House, 46-C, J.L. Nehru Road, P.O. Chowringhree, P.S. Shakespeare Sarani, Town & District- Kolkata (West Bengal)

... Petitioner

-Versus-

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Water Resources, Govt. of Jharkhand, having its office at Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi
3. The Chief Engineer (P & M), Water Resources Department, Government of Jharkhand, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi
4. The Chief Engineer, Subarnarekha Multi Purpose Project, Chandil
5. The Superintending Engineer, Subarnarekha Dam Division No. II, Chandil
6. The Executive Engineer, Subarnarekha Dam Division No. II, Chandil

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner :
For the State : Ms. Varsha Ramsisaria, A.C. to G.P.-V

28/29.09.2026 This writ petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for quashing the order dated 06.07.2010 passed by the Executive Engineer purportedly in compliance of the order dated 24.05.2010 passed in W.P.(C) No.1857 of 2010, whereby, this Court has directed the petitioner to file a representation before respondent no.5, who in turn was to take a decision by passing the reasoned order in relation to the dispute/controversy involved therein, but the representation of the petitioner has been disposed of on the ground of limitation.

2. Mr. Nitin Kumar Pasari, learned counsel submits that now the company has gone for winding up before the National Company Law Tribunal, Kolkata and Resolution Professional has been appointed. He further submits that in

the last week, he has taken adjournment to take instruction and file a fresh Vakalatnama. He next submits that he has contacted the representative of the company, however, they have not come forward and in view of that, he submits that appropriate order may kindly be passed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-State submits that since Resolution Professional has already been appointed, the matter can be resolved before the Resolution Professional. She further submits that once the plan is approved, the matter can proceed accordingly.

4. In view of the above and considering that in spite of the efforts taken by Mr. Nitin Kumar Pasari, learned counsel the company has not come forward to give him further instruction, which prima facie suggests that the petitioner has lost interest in the matter and, as such, this writ petition is, hereby, dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated: 29th September, 2026
Ajay/