IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
INHERENT JURISDICTION

Review Petition (C) No. 1066 / 2025
(Arising out of Civil Appeal No. 14826 / 2024)

Pradeep Puri …Petitioner(s)

versus

Noida Toll Bridge Company Limited and Ors. …Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1. **The instant Review Petition arises from the judgment dated 20.12.2024 passed in Civil Appeal No. 14826/2024, i.e. Noida Toll Bridge Company Ltd. (NTBCL) v. Federation of NOIDA Residents Welfare Association and Ors. The Review Petitioner is aggrieved by certain observations made in paragraph 62 of the judgment and has prayed for expunging that entire paragraph.**

2. **The Review Petitioner claims that the Comptroller Auditor General (CAG) Report makes no reference to him, except in paragraph 8.3.1, wherein it merely notes that he held particular posts in NTBCL for limited periods of time. In this respect, he believes that he is likely to be severely prejudiced as the contents of paragraph 62 of the judgment may be used to initiate other proceedings against him.**

3. **The Review Petitioner has raised concerns primarily because he was not a party to the Civil Appeal. It was submitted that: (*i*) due to his advanced age; (*ii*) the fact that he retired several**

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SATISH KUMAR YADAV
Date: 2025.09.12 14:16:27 IST
Reason:

years ago; and (*iii*) since he had no knowledge of the proceedings pending before this Court, it may not be justified to make adverse comments against him by name, especially when he had no opportunity to respond to any such allegations.

4. **Having sympathetically considered the above-noticed attenuating circumstances, it seems appropriate to us, in the interest of justice, to substantially accept the Review Petitioner's prayer. Consequently, his name can be omitted from paragraph 62 of our judgement. Ordered accordingly.**

5. **We, however, do not deem it necessary to expunge the entirety of paragraph 62 of the judgement, more so for the reason that this paragraph also contains a summary of some of the key findings of the CAG Report.**

6. **Consequentially, we modify paragraph 62 of our judgement dated 20.12.2024 and direct that the said paragraph shall be read as follows:**

> ***"62. The CAG Report noted in Section 8.4.5 that the payment of excessive fees to the Directors of NTBCL was unjustified, given the size of the company and the fact that such fees placed an unnecessary strain on its viability. Further, Section 8.4.7 of the CAG Report states that legal fees amounting to Rupees 26.19 crores were added to the Total Project Cost. Similarly, excessive O&M expenses and the cost of restructuring deep discount bonds at Rupees 12.43 crores (which was recompensed to IL&FS) without a proportionate reduction in the Rate of Return, were added to the Total Project Cost. More egregiously, NTBCL seems to have incurred an expenditure of Rupees 72.25 lakhs on account of purchase and distribution of 'Corporate Gifts', including the generous distribution of gold coins to its employees, sub-staff and drivers."***

7. The Registry is directed to carry out the necessary corrections in the main judgement and thereafter, re-upload it on the Supreme Court website.

8. The instant petition stands disposed of in the above terms. Ordered accordingly.

.....J.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(UJJAL BHUYAN)

NEW DELHI;
JULY 24, 2025

ITEM NO.301 COURT NO.2 SECTION III-A

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

R.P.(C) No. 1066/2025 in C.A. No. 14826/2024

PRADEEP PURI **Petitioner(s)**

VERSUS

NOIDA TOLL BRIDGE COMPANY LIMITED & ORS. **Respondent(s)**

(IA No. 7308/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 24-07-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE UJJAL BHUYAN

For Petitioner(s) **Mr. Piyush Joshi, Adv.**
Ms. Sumiti Yadava, Adv.
Ms. Vatsla Bhatia, Adv.
Ms. Sonakshi Malhan, AOR

For Respondent(s) **Mr. Suvigya Awasthy, Adv.**
Mr. Sameer Jain, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Joshi, Adv.
Mr. Deepesh Raj, Adv.
Mr. Nishant Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Ved P. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Kushagra Pandey, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

The instant petition stands disposed of in terms of the signed reportable order, which is placed on the file.

(SATISH KUMAR YADAV) **(PREETHI T.C.)**
ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR **ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**