IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 7103 of 2026

M/s. Micro Macro Enterprises, having its office at Gari Basti, Opposite SDA Mission Hospital, Bariatu Road, PO & PS-Bariyatu, District-Ranchi, through its duly authorized partner namely, Shardendu Narayan, S/o Late Pancha Nand Prasad, R/o C-601, Estate Esquare, Cheshire Home Road, Dipatoli, PO & PS-Bariyatu, District-Ranchi ... … Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi
3. The Chief Engineer (CDO), Department of Drinking Water and Sanitation, Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi
4. The Executive Engineer, Drinking Water and Sanitation Division (Ranchi West), Raja Rani Kothi, Near Nepal House, Doranda, Ranchi … … Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arpit Kumar, Advocate
Mr. Apurba Banerjee, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Shivam Kumar, AC to AG

Order No. 03 **Dated: 23.09.2026**

1. The grievance of the petitioner as raised in the present writ petition is that despite the petitioner having completed the work for "preparation of 10 Nos. PFR, DPR including preparation of Bid document in EPC/Turnkey/Item rate mode, etc. for Rural Water Supply Schemes/Weirs under different RWSS" and a completion certificate having been issued to it, its payment towards "excess population" in terms with the agreement has not been made.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner made several representations in this regard before the concerned authorities, however, the same remained unresponded, which compelled it to prefer the present writ petition.

3. Mr. Shivam Kumar, learned AC to AG appearing on behalf of the respondents, submits that the respondent no. 3 is the competent authority to take appropriate decision in this regard. It is further submitted that if the petitioner prefers a fresh representation raising the aforesaid claim before the respondent no. 3, an appropriate decision in accordance with law will be taken within a timeframe.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and considering the nature of prayer made in the writ petition, without delving into the petitioner's aforesaid claim, it is given liberty to prefer a fresh representation raising the claim as raised in the present writ petition before the respondent no. 3. On receipt of the said representation, the respondent no. 3, after verifying the relevant records and on providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner's representative, shall take an appropriate informed decision in accordance with law within eight weeks from the date of filing of the representation.

5. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with aforesaid liberty and direction.

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

September 23, 2026
Manish

Uploaded on 24.09.2026