IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

I.A. No. 14594 of 2025
In
L.P.A. No. 831 of 2025

---

1. The State of Jharkhand through Commissioner-cum-Secretary, Finance Department, Government of Jharkhand, Project Building, PO & PS Dhurwa, Dist. Ranchi.
2. The Joint Commissioner, Accounts Administration-cum-Director, Provident Fund Directorate, Jharkhand, Project Building, PO & PS Dhurwa, Dist. Ranchi.
3. The District Provident Fund Officer, Saraikela-Kharsawan, PO & PS: Saraikela-Kharsawan Dist.: Saraikela-Kharsawan, Jharkhand.
4. The District Treasury Officer, Saraikela-Kharsawan, PO & PS: Saraikela - Kharsawan, Dist.: Saraikela - Kharsawan, Jharkhand. .....**Appellant(s)**

Versus

1. Ram Lala Thakur, aged about 73 years son of Late Ram Bhajan Thakur, permanent resident of Village Phoolparasi, P.O. Singrahi, P.S. Sahiyara, District Sitamarhi and presently residing at Mohalla Srikishanapuri, W.No.04, Dumra Nagar Panchayat, at P.O. and P.S. Dumra, District Sitamarhi (Bihar), Pin-843301. .....**Respondent/Writ Petitioner**
2. The Accountant General, State of Jharkhand, PO & PS Doranda, District Ranchi, Jharkhand.
.....**Respondent/Respondent**

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Appellant(s) : Mr. Aditya Kumar, A.C. to Sr.S.C.-I
For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Amit Kumar Verma, Advocate

02/Dated: 25.08.2026

1. Heard Mr. Aditya Kumar, A.C. to Sr.S.C.-I for the applicants.

2. I.A. No. 14594 of 2025 seeks condonation of delay of 245 days in instituting the accompanying appeal.

3. On perusal of the averments in the I.A., we find that the same only lists a chronology of the movement of files from one officer to another and from one table to another.

4. Besides, in numerous cases decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court, it is held that such reasons do not constitute sufficient cause.

5. Accordingly, by relying upon the reasoning in order dated 16.06.2026 in ***L.P.A. No. 741 of 2025*** and the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of ***Postmaster General and Others vs. Living Media India Limited and Another***[1], ***State of Odisha and Others vs. Managing Committee of Namatara Girls High School***[2], ***Union of India & Anr. Vs. Jahangir Byramji Jeejeebhoy (D), through his LR***[3] and ***Shivamma (Dead) by Lrs. Vs. Karnataka Housing Board & Ors.***[4], we are satisfied that no sufficient cause has been shown for condoning the delay.

6. Mr. Aditya Kumar, however, argued that the appellant-State has a good case on merits and therefore, we must construe sufficient cause liberally.

7. Having a good case on merits is not a ground for condonation of delay. In any event, on perusing the impugned

---

[1] (2012) 3 SCC 563
[2] 2026 SCC OnLine SC 191
[3] 2024 SCC OnLine SC 489
[4] 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1969

order, we find that the learned Single Judge has followed the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Amresh Kumar Singh and others v. State of Bihar and others,*** reported in ***2023 SCC OnLine SC 496,*** to grant relief to the respondent herein.

8. Since the matter is covered by a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, it is futile to now urge that the appellant has a good case on merits. For all the above reasons, we dismiss I.A. No. 14594 of 2025 seeking condonation of delay.

L.P.A. No. 831 of 2025

9. As a consequence, the accompanying Letters Patent Appeal would not survive and is disposed of. No costs.

10. Pending I.As., if any, also stand closed and disposed of.

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

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

AUGUST 25, 2026
Amardeep/vikas
Uploaded on
1.9.2026