IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P. (C) No. 2714 of 2024

Maa Mundeshwari Carbon Private Limited, A Company incorporated under the provisions of the Companies Act, 1956, having its Registered Office at 2B, Konark Apartment, East Boring Canal Road, Patna, P.O. G.P.O. P.S. Budha Colony, Town & District Patna, PIN-800001, Bihar through one of its Directors, namely, Manoj Kumar Singh, aged about 53 years, son of Shri Rajeshwar Prasad Singh, resident of Flat No. 28, Konark Apartment, Near Punch Mukhi Mandir, East Boaring Cannal Road, Patna, P.O. G.P.O. P.S. Budha Colony, Town & District Patna, PIN-800001, Bihar. … Petitioner

Versus

1. Coal India Limited, through its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, having its office at Ground Floor, Coal Bhawan, New Town, Rajarhat, P.O. & P.S. Kolkata, District Kolkata (West Bengal),
2. The General Manager (M&S-Commercial), Coal India Limited, having its office at Ground Floor, Coal Bhawan, New Town, Rajarhat, P.O. & P.S. Kolkata, District Kolkata (West Bengal),
3. The Central Coalfields Limited, through its Chairman-cum-Managing Director, having its office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi, P.O. G.P.O., P.S. Kotwali, District Ranchi, PIN-834001, Jharkhand.
4. The General Manager (Sales & Marketing Department), Central Coalfields Limited, having its office at Darbhanga House, Ranchi, P.O. & P.S. Doranda, District Ranchi, PINI- 834002, Jharkhand.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR

For the Petitioner: Mr Sumeet Gadodia, Advocate
Mr Ritesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate
Mr Anish Lal, Advocate

For the Respondents: Mr Amit Kumar Sinha, Advocate

10/Dated: 14.09.2026

1. Heard Mr Gadodia for the petitioner and Mr Amit Kumar Sinha for the respondents.

2. The petitioner challenges order dated 05.06.2023 blacklisting the petitioner.

3. Earlier, the petitioner had filed at least two petitions in Patna to challenge the blacklisting orders which preceded the impugned order concerning the same transaction before the Hon'ble Patna High Court. In fact, the records show that by order dated 19.10.2020 in C.W.J.C. No. 55 of 2019, the petitioner secured relief from the Hon'ble Patna High Court, and the matter was remanded to the authorities to pass a fresh order in accordance with law within three months.

4. The present impugned order was passed pursuant to such remand, and the petitioner had filed C.W.J.C. No. 9958 of 2023, again before the Hon'ble Patna High Court to challenge the same.

5. Mr Gadodia, learned counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that the Hon'ble Patna High Court did not entertain C.W.J.C. No. 9958 of 2023 for want of territorial jurisdiction. He submits that this has been pleaded by the petitioner in paragraph 51 of the writ petition.

6. The order dated 27.09.2023, passed by the Hon'ble Patna High Court in C.W.J.C. No. 9958 of 2023, has been placed on record as Annexure 24, pages 142-143 of the paper-book of this petition. The order merely indicates that the learned counsel for the petitioner, after arguing the matter at length, sought permission to withdraw the petition. The petition was then withdrawn, reserving liberty to the petitioner to invoke the appropriate remedy before the appropriate forum. There is no reference to the issue of any want of territorial jurisdiction.

7. Though the above order dated 27.09.2023 refers to liberty being granted to the petitioner to invoke remedy before the appropriate forum, that by itself, does not mean that the Hon'ble Patna High Court had expressed any opinion on the alleged lack of territorial jurisdiction. By way of averments in the petition or affidavits, the orders of the Hon'ble Court cannot be sought to be explained by the parties.

8. In any event, since on two earlier occasions petitions filed by this very writ petitioner in relation to its blacklisting were entertained by the Hon'ble Patna High Court, we cannot readily accept that C.W.J.C. No. 9958 of 2023 was dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction, as contended by Mr Gadodia. We directed the Petitioner to file an affidavit on any interim reliefs granted by the Hon'ble Patna High Court in the previous proceedings. Even that direction has not been complied with.

9. Accordingly, by considering the above facts and circumstances, we decline to entertain this petition, leaving it open to the petitioner to resort to appropriate remedies available under the law.

10. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of with liberty in the above terms. Pending IAs, if any, will not survive and are disposed of. No costs.

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

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

September 14, 2026
N.A.F.R./Manoj/Sharda/Cp.2
Uploaded on 15.09.2026