IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(C) No. 6754 of 2026

Ajay Kumar Kushwaha, aged about 46 years, son of Tilak Mahto, resident of Fakira Pahari, P.O. Sabalpur, P.S. Suriya, District Giridih, Jharkhand.

... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Canara Bank, through its Deputy General Manager, Circle Office, Premises & Estate Section, Kaushalya Chambers, Main Road, PO-GPO & PS-Kotwali, Ranchi-834001.
3. General Manager, Premises & Estate Section, Canara Bank Head Office, GA Wing, No. 112, J.C. Road, P.O-Bangalore City & P.S-Kalasipalya Bengaluru - 560002, Karnataka.
4. Branch Manager, Canara Bank, Sabalpur Branch, P.O- Sabalpur P.S. Suriya, District Giridih, Jharkhand.
5. Tulsi Mahto, S/o Duli Mahto, R/o Fakirapahari, P.O. Sabalpur, P.S.-Sariya, District- Giridih.
6. Budhadev Mahto, S/o Tulsi Mahto, Fakirapahari, P.O. Sabalpur, P.S.-Sariya, District- Giridih.
7. Tuplal Mahto, S/o Tulsi Mahto, Fakirapahari, P.O. Sabalpur, P.S.-Sariya, District- Giridih.

... Respondents

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

For the Petitioner: Mr. Vidhan Kumar Singh, Advocate
For Resp. No.1: Mr. Vibhor Mayank, A.C. to A.G.
For Resp. Nos. 2-4: Mr. P.A.S. Pati, Advocate

02/Dated: 02.09.2026

1. Heard Mr Vidhan Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr Vibhor Mayank, learned A.C. to A.G. for respondent No. 1 and Mr P.A.S. Pati, learned counsel for respondent Nos. 2 to 4.

2. This petition seeks quashing of the offer document dated 30.01.2025 and subsequent memorandum dated 04.05.2026 proposing to take on lease the premises of respondent Nos. 5,

6 and 7, instead of continuing the lease in the petitioner's premises for operating the Sabalpur Branch of the Canara Bank.

3. Mr Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submitted that respondent Nos. 6 and 7 did not participate in the tender process and, therefore, any proposal to lease their premises is grossly arbitrary and warrants interference. He also submitted that the petitioner's premises, from where the bank presently operates, are much better suited and, without assigning any reasons, the offer made by the petitioner in the tender process could not have been rejected. He submits that such rejection is *ex facie* arbitrary and vitiated by *mala fides*.

4. Mr Pati, learned counsel for Canara Bank, submits that the 5th respondent, i.e. Sri Tulsi Mahto, participated in the tender process and his premises were adjudged as most suitable to be taken on lease. He submitted that there are several issues with continuing in the petitioner's premises, including water leakages, etc.

5. Mr Pati submitted that after the 5th respondent's premises were adjudged as most suitable, the documentation was carried out, at his request, with respondent Nos. 6 and 7, who are the sons of Sri Tulsi Mahto. He submitted that Sri Tulsi Mahto made this request on account of his old age and he intended to transfer this property to his sons, i.e. respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

6. Accordingly, Mr Pati submits that there is absolutely no arbitrariness involved, and the petitioner's argument that his

premises are better suited is untenable and, in any event, not a ground for judicial review in such matters.

7. The rival contentions now fall for our determination.

8. By this petition, the petitioner virtually insists that his premises should be adjudged as best suited for the bank to continue its operations. Normally, this is not for a writ Court to undertake such an exercise and determine which premises are best suited to the bank's interest.

9. The contention that respondent Nos. 6 and 7 never participated in the tender process must be considered in light of the explanation offered by the bank. Their father, Sri Tulsi Mahto, in whose name the property was recorded, did participate in the tender process. After Sri Tulsi Mahto's premises were adjudged as most suitable upon a comparative analysis of the bids/offer received, at Sri Tulsi Mahto's request, the documentation was carried out with the 6th and 7th respondents in respect of the very premises.

10. Sri Tulsi Mahto explained that, on account of his age, his sons look after the premises and that he also intended to transfer the premises to his sons shortly.

11. In fact, Mr Singh, the learned counsel for the petitioner, has placed on record a copy of the registered sale deed dated 02.08.2025 by which Sri Tulsi Mahto has transferred the premises in question to respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

12. Therefore, considering the above facts, we find no arbitrariness involved in the action of the respondents-bank. A fair,

transparent and reasonable process was followed. Even the petitioner's bid/offer was duly considered.

13. The scope of interference in such matters is quite limited. It is not for this Court to examine the relative merits and demerits of the premises which the bank seeks to take on lease for its operations.

14. For all the above reasons, we dismiss this petition without any order for costs. Pending Interlocutory Applications, if any, do not survive and are disposed of.

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

(Rajesh Shankar, J.)

September 02, 2026
N.A.F.R.
APK/VK
Uploaded on 03 09.2026