IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 3809 of 2012

Devwati Rajak, W/o Jagdish Rajak, resident of B Block, Kagalnagar, Near Pani Tanki, Sonari, P.O. and P.S. Sonari, Town, Jamshedpur, District East Singhbhum.

..... … Petitioner

Versus

Tata Steel Limited having its Registered Office at 24, Homi Mody Street, Fort, Mumabai, and its Works at Jamshedpur, Pragana Dhalbhum, Po & PS- Dhalbhum District-Singhbhum East.

..... … Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. J.N. Upadhyay, Advocate.
For the Tata Steel : Mr. A.K. Das, Sr. Advocate.
: Mr. Kanishka Deo, Advocate.

19/ 18.08.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent-Tata Steel.

2. This writ petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for quashing of the order dated 22.05.2012, passed in Miscellaneous Case No. 18 of 2017, by the learned Sub-Judge-I, Jamshedpur, whereby the application filed by the respondent under Order VI Rule 17 read with Section 151 of CPC has been allowed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has earlier filed a suit, which was decreed in his favour and thereafter the execution case has been filed and in the said execution case, the Tata Steel has appeared, wherein the said application has been filed and the same was allowed by the learned court.

4. Learned senior counsel appearing for the respondent-Tata Steel submits that in the earlier suit, the Tata Steel was not made party and the land in question is the leasehold area of Tata Steel and in view of that collusive decree was obtained and in view of that Tata Steel has filed an application under Order XXI Rules 97 and 99 read with Section

151 of the CPC. He next submits that in that proceeding, an application under Order VI, Rule 17 read with Section 151 of the CPC has been filed, which was allowed. He further submits that both the sides have already led their evidences in the said case including the evidence on the point of amendment prayer and now the miscellaneous case has been fixed for judgment after conclusion of the hearing of both the sides.

5. In view of the above and considering that on the said amendment prayer also, the evidence has already been led by both the sides and now the case is fixed for judgment. As such, the points taken herein has already been argued before the learned court and evidence has already been led, wherein the said miscellaneous case is pending. As such, nothing survives in the petition to decide, in view of the above development. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

Dated:-18.08.2026
Amitesh/-