IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(C) No. 6956 of 2026
------

1. Neena Verma, Wife of Late Mahesh Chandra Verma, Resident of Shivalik Green View Apartment, Flat No.B-402, Near Rajendra Chowk, Doranda, PO & PS-Doranda, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. Niraj Verma, Son of Shri Satish Chandra Verma, Resident of Shivalik Green View Apartment, Flat No.B-402, Near Rajendra Chowk, Doranda, PO & PS-Doranda, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.

... ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand, through the Chief Secretary, at Project Building, Dhurwa, Ranchi, PO-Dhurwa, PS-Jagarnathpur, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
2. Municipal Commissioner, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi, at Kutchery Road, PO, GPO, PS-Kotwali, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. Deputy Municipal Commissioner, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi, at Kutchery Road, PO, GPO, PS-Kotwali, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. Town Planer, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi, at Kutchery Road, PO, GPO, PS-Kotwali, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
5. Assistant Town Planner, Ranchi Municipal Corporation, Ranchi, at Kutchery Road, PO, GPO, PS-Kotwali, Dist-Ranchi, Jharkhand.
6. Rajendra Prasad & Bros., through its Agent / Authorized Representative Mr. Virendra Prasad, Son of (not known to the petitioners), resident of Flat No.301, Green Field Emperia, Sita Compound, Main Road, PO & PS-Chutia, Dist-Ranchi.

... ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : SRI ANANDA SEN, J.

For the Petitioner(s) : Mr. R.N. Sahay, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Yashvardhan, Adv.

For the Respondent(s) : Mr. Manish Mishra, GP-V
Dr. Vandana Singh, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Aliza, Adv.

02/ 07th September, 2026

1. Heard the parties.

2. The petitioners have challenged Annexure-5 & Annexure-6 to this writ petition.

3. Annexure-5 is a demand of Rs.25,000/- as fine on the ground that the petitioner could not produce the trade license.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners refers to Annexure-2 which is a Provisional Municipal Trade License. The

Provisional License was valid up to 19.01.2026 but as per the Clause 11, if there is no objection from Ranchi Municipal Corporation, the license shall be deemed to be approved.

5. The learned counsel submits that since there is no objection from Ranchi Municipal Corporation, this license is deemed to be approved. Thus, the issuance of Annexure-5 which is demand of Rs.25,000/- is absolutely bad.

6. Considering his submission on this issue, I direct the petitioners to approach the Commissioner, Ranchi Municipal Corporation along with all the documents and place his defence. The Ranchi Municipal Commissioner will consider the documents and the case of the petitioners and thereafter, only will take an appropriate decision as to whether the amount of Rs.25,000/- by way of fine can be levied upon the petitioners or not and whether the Trade License issued is valid or not.

7. So far as Annexure-6 is concerned, the same is a notice issued to the petitioners alleging that the petitioners have encroached the Setback / Road Widening area and has made some construction, which needs to be removed.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners is a mere tenant and he has got no ownership over the property in question and he has not made any encroachment.

9. Considering his submission, since the petitioners are admitting to be a tenant and is not claiming any ownership over the property in question, the notice could not have been issued to the petitioners. The notice should be issued to the owner of the building and thereafter, if it is found that there is an encroachment, the Ranchi Municipal Corporation can take steps for removing the same.

10. With the aforesaid observation, this writ petition is **disposed of.**

(ANANDA SEN, J.)

07th September, 2026
S.K.D/CP-2

Uploaded on 08/09/2026