

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
W.P.(S) No. 5313 of 2010

1. Smt. Shikha Das
2. Smt. Helen Hansda
3. Smt. Meena Kumari Sharma
4. Smt. Chhaya Sneha Lata Murmu
5. Smt. Noor Sawarnlata Tudu
6. Smt. Maya Esthar Murmu Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Social Welfare
of Women and Child Development, Jharkhand, Ranchi
3. The Commissioner, Santhal Pargana Division,
Dumka. Jharkhand
4. The Dy. Commissioner, Sahibganj, Jharkhand
5. The Director, Department of Social Welfare,
Jharkhand, Ranchi Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioners : None
 For the Resp. State : Mr. J.F. Toppo, SC-VII

06/ 08.09.2021 Heard through V.C.

2. None appears for the petitioners even on repeated calls. However, Mr. J.F. Toppo, learned counsel is present for the respondent State.

3. Order dated 05.08.2021 reads as follows:

“Heard through V.C.

2. *Nobody appears for the petitioners even on repeated calls.*

3. *Order dated 09.07.2021 reads as follows:*

“Nobody appeared on behalf of the petitioner even on repeated calls.

Mr. J.F. Toppo, learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that since the matter is very old and he prays some time to seek latest instruction in the matter.

Time, as prayed for, is granted.

Put up this case on 05.08.2021.”

4. *In spite of the aforesaid order, none appears for the petitioner. However, Mr. J.F. Toppo, learned counsel is present for the respondent State.*

5. *With a view to give one more opportunity to the petitioner, put up this case on 08.09.2021.*

6. *Let a copy of this order be sent to the petitioner.”*

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, true copy of the order dated 05.08.2021 was sent to the petitioners. However, undelivered registered cover with A/D has been received on behalf of petitioner Nos. 1, 3 and 5. It appears that the same could not be served because either there is insufficient address or petitioners have left that place. For petitioner Nos. 2, 4 and 6 the report has not yet received and 30 days has lapsed after issuance of letter informing the petitioners.

5. Mr. J.F. Toppo, learned counsel appearing for the respondent State submits that a letter has been received in the department from petitioner No.1 that the entire benefit has been paid to her, as such she did not want to proceed in the matter.

6. Forced with this situation, the instant writ application is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)