IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

Civil Review No. 109 of 2024

1. The State of Jharkhand through the Principal Secretary, Department of Revenue and Land Reforms, Government of Jharkhand having its office at Project Building, P.O: Dhurwa, P.S: Jagarnathpur, Ranchi.
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O & P.S: Ranchi, District: Ranchi.
3. The Additional Commissioner, Ranchi, P.O & P.S: Ranchi, District: Ranchi.
4. The Circle officer, Nagri, P.O & P.S: Nagri, District: Ranchi.
5. The Circle officer, Ratu, P.O & P.S: Ratu, District: Ranchi.

... Petitioners

Versus

Pradip Modi, Son of: Late Prabhu Dayal Modi, presently residing in Flat no. 601, Amal Tash Building, Modi Compound, behind Arya Hotel, P.O & P.S: Lalpur, District: Ranchi

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioners: Mr Mrinal Kanti Roy, G.A.-I

02/Dated: 29.10.2026

1. Heard Mr Mrinal Kanti Roy, learned G.A.-I for the review petitioners.

2. I.A. No. 9866 of 2024 seeks condonation of delay of 371 days in filing the accompanying review petition against the judgment and order dated 4th August 2023 in L.P.A. No. 683 of 2018.

3. The only reason cited for this inordinate delay is that "certain facts allegedly came to the notice of the petitioners", and these facts necessitate filing the present review petition.

4. First, the pleadings about "certain facts" coming to the notice of the petitioners are vague. Secondly, the review petitioners in this case are the State, not a private party. Therefore, all these

alleged facts were well within the records maintained by the State itself. Based on a vague statement that such facts "*coming to notice",* the 371-day delay cannot be explained. As such, we are satisfied that no sufficient cause has been shown for condoning this delay.

5. Mr Roy, however, submitted that the review petitioners have a very good case and a good chance of success in this review petition.

6. At the stage of considering an application seeking condonation of delay, the Court does not need to or can go into the merits of the matter. However, even if the State is to be granted some indulgence, we find that the review is also premised on alleged "*certain facts coming to the notice*" of the petitioners.

7. Here again, we note that the State itself had custody of all these matters; therefore, the plea that they came to the State's notice later cannot be accepted. In any event, based on the alleged facts referred to in the review petition, no case for exercise of review jurisdiction is made out.

8. Besides, the impugned order clearly notes that this was a matter only concerning mutation and issue of rent receipts. The learned Single Judge's order against which L.P.A. No. 683 of 2018, against which this review is now applied, has already observed that mutation orders neither confer any right upon the parties nor extinguish any rights, if already existing. Therefore, the State is not remediless if it is serious about its claim.

9. For the above reasons, we dismiss I.A. No. 9866 of 2024 and consequently, the accompanying review petition. No costs.

10. Pending Interlocutory Applications, if any, do not survive and are disposed of.

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

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

October 29, 2026

N.A.F.R.

APK/VK

Uploaded on 30.10.2026