

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3463 of 2020

Dr Surendra Kumar Anand @ Surendra Kr. Anand @
Surendra Kumar Anand **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Sarita Bharti **Opposite Parties**

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RONGON MUKHOPADHYAY
Through- Video Conferencing

For the Petitioner : Mr. Pratiush Lala, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Sanat Kr. Jha, A.P.P.

02/14.09.2020 So far as defect nos. 3, 4, 5(e) and 9(i) are concerned learned counsel for the petitioner undertakes to remove the same once the situation normalizes. As regards, the rest defects are concerned, the same are ignored.

It has been stated by the learned counsel for the petitioner that both the petitioner as well as the complainant are in the medical profession. It has further been stated that the dispute arose on account of the refusal by the petitioner to come to Dhanbad and start practicing at the insistence of the opposite party no. 2.

Issue notice to the opposite party no. 2, both under registered cover with A/D as well as under ordinary process, for which, requisite etc. be filed within a period of two weeks.

Let this case be listed under the heading **“For Admission”** after notice is served upon the opposite party no. 2.

Until further order, there shall be no coercive step as against the petitioner in connection with Complaint Case No. 2486/2019, pending in the court of learned J.M.F.C., Dhanbad.

(R. Mukhopadhyay, J.)