IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Cont. Case (Civil) No. 842 of 2024

Ram Shankar Bhagat, Son of Late Shital Prasad, aged about 70 years, Resident of Quarter No. B-184/2, Sector-II, H.E.C. Colony, P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagannathpur, District Ranchi **..Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand
2. Vandana Dadel, Wife of Not known to the petitioner, acting as Vigilance Commissioner, Cabinet (Vigilance) Department, Government of Jharkhand, officiating from her office at Engineers' Hostel, H.E.C. P.O. Dhurwa, P.S. Jagannathpur, District Ranchi **..Opposite parties**

With

Civil Review No. 108 of 2026

Ram Shankar Bhagat, aged about 71 years Son of- Late Shital Prasad, resident of Quarter No. B-184/2, Sector-II, H.E.C. Colony, P.O.- Dhurwa, P.S.- Jagannathpur, District Ranchi **..Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Jharkhand
2. The Vigilance Commissioner, Cabinet (Vig) Department, Government of Jharkhand, office at-Engineer's Hostel, HEC, P.O.-Dhurwa, P.S.-Jagannathpur, District-Ranchi-834004
3. Additional Director General of Police, Anti-Corruption Bureau, Kanke Road, P.O.-Morabadi, P.S.-Gonda, District-Ranchi-834008
4. State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Water Resource Department, Government of Bihar, having office at New Secretariat Bailey Road, P.O.+P.S.-Punai Chack, District-Patna.
5. The Managing Director, BHALCO, office at Daroga Prasad Rai Path, (Bihind Patna High Court, P.O. +P.S-Sachiwalaya, District-Patna-800015, Bihar
6. The Managing Director JHALCO, office at Laxmi P.O.-Morabadi, P.S.-Niwas Kanke Road, Gonda, District-Ranchi-834008 **..Respondents**

--

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN**

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. Parth Jalan, Advocate
For the O.P.-State : Mr. Suraj Prakash, Adv.

--

06/02.11.2026 The instant review application has been preferred by the petitioner to review of the order dated 24.04.2024, whereby a liberty was granted to the respondents to pass appropriate order

in the light of the order passed in the case of Rajeshwar Prasad [W.P.(S) No. 1935 of 2024] upon representation filed by the petitioner.

2. It has been informed by learned counsel for the rival parties that fresh impugned order has been passed.

3. Accordingly, this Court feels that instead of pursuing the contempt as well as review application, interest of justice would be sufficed by directing the petitioner to file a fresh writ application challenging the fresh impugned order dated 6th August, 2024 issued under Memo no. 1056.

4. Accordingly, this review application being Civil Review No. 108 of 2026 and also Contempt Case being Cont. Case (Civil) No. 842 of 2024 stand closed with liberty to the petitioner to file fresh writ application challenging the fresh impugned order dated 6th August, 2024.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

2nd November, 2026
Jk
Uploaded on
06/11/2026