IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL ORIGINAL/APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION(S)(CIVIL) NO.704/2025

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THAKUR SHREE BANKEY BIHARI JI MAHARAJ TEMPLE & ANR. PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS. RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

M.A. Diary No.28487/2025 in C.A. No.6855/2025

M.A. Diary No(s).29320/2025 in C.A. No.6855/2025

W.P.(C) No.709/2025

M.A. Diary No(s).39950/2025 in C.A. No.6855/2025

M.A. Diary No(s).39984/2025 in C.A. No.6855/2025

W.P.(C) No.707/2025

W.P.(C) No.734/2025

W.P(C) No.752/2025

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.

2. Permission to file miscellaneous applications is granted. Permission to appear and argue in-person is granted.

3. Applications for impleadment/intervention are allowed. Cause title be amended accordingly.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by ARJUN BISHT
Date: 2025.08.09 18:30:16 IST
Reason:

4. The present batch of Writ Petition(s) and Miscellaneous Application(s) chiefly pertain to the management and development

of the Thakur Shree Bankey Bihari Ji Maharaj Temple at Vrindavan, Mathura in Uttar Pradesh (hereinafter, "the Temple"). The core concerns of the petitioners seem to stem from the promulgation of the Uttar Pradesh Shri Bankey Bihari Ji Temple Trust Ordinance, 2025 (hereinafter, "the Ordinance") which allows the State to establish a Trust for managing the affairs of the Temple.

5. At the outset, we may briefly advert to the factual circumstances relevant for the purposes of the present adjudication. The subject-Temple is admittedly a centuries-old, world-renowned destination for Hindu devotees and pilgrims in India, with significant spiritual and cultural import. It is a matter of record that the Temple was constructed in 1864 on land gifted by Raja Ratan Singh. Over the following decades, differences regarding Temple management arose between two branches of the Temple-administrators, i.e. the Shebait Goswamis/Gosains (hereinafter, "the Goswamis"). These two groups are known as the *Raj Bhog* and the *Shayan Bhog*.

6. This dispute culminated in Civil Suit No. 156 of 1938 being filed before the Court of Munsif at Mathura, which, *vide* its judgment dated 31.03.1939, framed a 'Scheme of Management' (hereinafter, "1939 Scheme") for the Temple. Notably, under this Scheme, the Temple Managing Committee was established, comprising of seven Members who were entrusted with critical responsibilities related to the Temple's day-to-day functioning. Both the Goswami branches elected two Members each, while the remaining three were nominated by the elected Members themselves. Importantly, the Munsif/Civil Judge himself played the key role of settling any disputes between the elected Members regarding the nominations.

7. Several decades later in June 2016, further differences arose between the two groups regarding the nomination of the three Members to be appointed following elections under the aforementioned Scheme. To resolve the deadlock, Case No. 4822 of

2016 was filed before the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad (hereinafter, "the High Court") under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. *Vide* order dated 27.07.2016, the High Court directed that, until the issue concerning the management of the Temple was finally adjudicated, the Munsif/Civil Judge, Mathura, would continue to oversee the Temple's affairs either personally or through a person appointed by him in accordance with the 1939 Scheme. Thus, in effect, while the day-to-day functioning remained with the Goswami Shebaits, all final approvals concerning Temple administration were to be routed through the Civil Judge, Mathura.

8. In 2022, a most unfortunate tragedy occurred on the Temple premises, wherein a stampede caused several injuries and two deaths. Assailing this sorry state of affairs, one Anant Sharma filed a Public Interest Litigation bearing No. 1509 of 2022 before the High Court *inter alia* praying for the striking down of the 1939 Scheme and handing over of Temple Management to the State of Uttar Pradesh (hereinafter, "the State").

9. In those proceedings, the State proposed the establishment of an independent Trust for the management of the Temple, apart from suggesting certain redevelopment plans that would be beneficial for the devotees. The Goswamis' impleadment applications in this PIL were initially not entertained by the High Court, noting that their rights were not affected by the State's plans, which chiefly related to developing the Temple's vicinity. However, they were allowed to assist the Court on the limited aspect of redevelopment. Ultimately, the High Court *vide* order dated 08.11.2023, approved the State's plans for developing a 'Temple Corridor' by acquiring and developing 5 acres of land proximate to the Temple, to better ensure public health and safety. It is worth noting that the High Court did not allow the State to utilize any funds from the Temple/deity's account in furtherance of this exercise, and instead directed that all the expenses were to be borne by the State exchequer.

10. It merits mentioning that the State did not assail the High Court's order dated 08.11.2023, which consequently attained finality.

11. Parallelly, in *Ishwar Chanda Sharma v. Devendra Kumar Sharma & ors.,* Civil Appeal No. 6855 of 2025 (arising out of Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 29702/2024), a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court was considering a challenge to the proper administration of the Sri Giriraj Temple at Govardhan, Mathura. In those proceedings, the Bench enlarged the appeal's scope and impleaded the State of Uttar Pradesh with a view to improve the conditions and facilities of various temples located in the 'Braj' region of Uttar Pradesh which, *inter alia*, includes the subject-Temple.

12. It is in this factual backdrop, that a two-Judge Bench of this Court therein heard and disposed the appeal, without impleading the Goswamis. We are not concerned with this Court's observations in respect of the Sri Giriraj Temple. However, the learned two-Judge Bench in the same ruling allowed the State to utilize the subject-Temple's funds for acquisition of the aforementioned 5 acres of land for redevelopment, with the *caveat* that the land would be registered in the deity's name – thereby essentially modifying the High Court's directions pertaining to the exclusive use of State funds in its order dated 08.11.2023.

13. As a result thereof, the present Miscellaneous Applications have been filed seeking the modification of this Court's observations and directions in *Ishwar Chanda Sharma (supra)*, so far as the same pertain to the use of funds from the subject-Temple for acquisition of land by the State.

14. Meanwhile, the State of Uttar Pradesh promulgated the Ordinance, which has been challenged in the connected Writ Petitions. The Ordinance, as already noted hereinabove, *inter alia* contemplates the establishment of a Trust for managing the affairs of the Temple, and ostensibly overturns the longstanding

1939 Scheme.

15. We have heard learned Senior Counsel/Counsel for the parties, as well learned Additional Solicitor General representing the State of Uttar Pradesh, and perused the voluminous record.

16. It seems to us that the order passed by a Co-ordinate Bench in *Ishwar Chanda Sharma (supra)* requires certain modifications/clarifications. That order purportedly directs for the redevelopment of the subject-Temple's vicinity through the employment of Temple funds. However, we find that such directions suffer from a foundational procedural infirmity: the principal affected parties, including the Shebait Goswamis, who have been administering the Temple, were not heard prior to the passing of said order.

17. It is a matter of record that the administration and management of the subject-Temple were never a point of controversy in *Ishwar Chanda Sharma (supra)*. The proceedings before that Bench arose from a civil dispute entirely unconnected to the subject-Temple's governance. As such, to allow substantive directions on a matter of such significance to be issued in collateral proceedings, especially *in absentia* of the necessary stakeholders, may not be in conformity with procedural fairness and judicial best-practices.

18. That apart, we note that the High Court, *vide* its judgment dated 08.11.2023, had expressly declined the State's prayer to utilize Temple funds for land acquisition as part of the proposed redevelopment plan. That judgment – as noted heretofore – has attained finality, having never been assailed by the State in any appropriate appellate proceedings. In these circumstances this Court could not have, in exercise of its civil appellate jurisdiction, effectively set aside the High Court's judgment without any formal appeal or challenge being placed before it.

19. We, therefore, deem it appropriate to modify the order dated 15.05.2025 passed in Civil Appeal No. 6855 of 2025, and restore the legal position to *status quo ante*. The rights and obligations of the parties shall be governed in terms of the judgment dated 08.11.2023 of the High Court, and as per the directions which are being issued issued in the present order.

20. Consequently, the Miscellaneous Application(s) stand allowed and the following paras from *Ishwar Chanda Sharma (supra)*, are ordered to be expunged:

> ***"16. It is suffice to say that the buck does not stop at the issue raised in the present SLP relating to the eligibility of a receiver for Sri Giriraj Temple, Govardhan, Mathura. The fact that the Civil Suit has been pending for over 25 years, with only receiver's running the show, goes to show that the issue of maladministration runs deep and wide. During the hearings, we have been apprised by Intervenor/Respondent No. 4 that other temples in the belt, including the Shri Banke Bihari Temple, have been facing severe administrative issues of crowd management and it is being administered by a civil judge.***
>
> ***17. It pains this Court to take notice of the fact that the temple was a site of an unfortunate stampede in 2022, caused due to the lack of infrastructure that can support the large crowd of devotees that visit the temple brimming with bhakti to offer their prayers. We have been apprised of the fact that the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad is currently seized of Public Interest Litigation No. 1509 of 2022, which was filed seeking directions in the aftermath of the stampede. While the High Court has accepted the State of Uttar Pradesh' scheme for the development of the area around the temple, it has refused to permit the State to utilize the Temple fund for the purpose of purchase of the land around the Temple premises by observing that the said issue is not yet adjudicated. The order dated 08.11.2013 passed in PIL No. 1509 of 2022 reads as under:***
>
> ***---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx---***
>
> ***18. In Rajeev Suri v. Delhi Development Authority & Ors. (2022) 11 SCC 1, or commonly known as the***

'Central Vista case', this Court decided a matter in larger public interest even though a separate court was seized of the same under Article 142 of the Constitution. This Court observed:

---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx---

19. As this Court is in sesin of the cause qua the administration and safety of temples in the Braj region, it is in public interest to decide the issue raised by Respondent No. 4/State of Uttar Pradesh expeditiously in this Court itself. Respondent No. 4 has placed on record the proposed scheme for development for the Temple. Upon a perusal of the same and the consequent assessments, it has been ascertained that 5 acres of land around the temple is to be acquired and developed by constructing parking lots, accommodation for the devotees, toilets, security check posts and other amenities. As observed by the High Court vide order dated 08.11.2023, the acquisition of land around the temple and the consequent development project is crucial to ensure the safety of the pilgrims.

20. The State of Uttar Pradesh has undertaken to incur costs of more than Rs.500 Crores to develop the corridor. However, they propose to utilise the Temple funds for purchasing the land in question; which was denied by the High Court vide order dated 08.11.2023. We permit the State of Uttar Pradesh to implement the Scheme in its entirety. The Banke Bihari Ji Trust is having fixed deposits in the name of the Deity/Temple. In the considered opinion of this Court, the State Government is permitted to utilize the amount lying in the fixed deposit to acquire the land proposed. However, the land acquired for the purposes of development of the temple and corridor shall be in the name of the Deity/Trust. The order dated 08.11.2023 passed by the High Court of Allahabad in Public Interest Litigation deserves to be modified to the aforesaid extent and it is modified accordingly.

---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx---

24. Accordingly, the order dated 08.11.2023 passed by the High Court of Allahabad in PIL No. 1509 of 2022 is modified to the extent that the State of Uttar Pradesh/Respondent No. 4 is permitted to utilise the temple fund in order to purchase the land around the Temple as per the Scheme proposed, provided that the land so acquired shall be in the name of the Deity/Trust…

---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx--- ---xxx---"

21. Coming now to the constitutional challenge to the subject-Ordinance, the Petitioners before us have vehemently urged that the State's hasty actions in promulgating the same after decades of complacency represent the very antithesis of good will. It is also submitted that the State may not be allowed to act in a circuitous manner, bypassing the High Court's final order regarding use of Temple funds.

22. At the very threshold, we see no valid ground to entertain the challenge directly before us. We say so, finding no compelling reason for the petitioners to invoke the writ jurisdiction of this Court under Article 32 of the Constitution at this juncture. Instead, in our considered opinion, the affected persons/petitioners have an equally efficacious remedy available under Article 226, *viz.* approaching the High Court.

23. Moreover, the High Court has dealt with the contentious issue of the Temple's management on a plethora of previous occasions. Consequently, we decline to entertain these writ petitions, which challenge the *vires* of the Ordinance. Instead, we deem it appropriate to relegate the affected persons, including the petitioners, to pursue all their remedies in law before the High Court.

24. Faced with this, Mr. K.M. Nataraj, learned Additional Solicitor General of India, representing the State of Uttar Pradesh, has pointed out that some parallel proceedings under Article 227 bearing No. 15949/2024 are being heard by a learned Single Judge of the High Court – which also pertain to the Ordinance's constitutionality. In that matter, while an *amicus* was initially appointed, most recently the hearings have been deferred due to the instant proceedings.

25. Mr. Nataraj also points out that *vide* order dated 21.07.2025, the learned Judge of the High Court has questioned the very competence of the State to issue the subject-Ordinance. Some observations made by the learned Judge on 06.08.2025, which

have since been extensively reported by the media, have also been brought to our notice.

26. Consequently, with a view to avoid parallel proceedings, we stay the operation of the order dated 21.07.2025 passed by the learned Judge of the High Court in Matters under Article 227 No. 15949/2024. Similarly, further proceedings therein shall also remain stayed.

27. Ordinarily when the constitutionality of a Statute/Ordinance is challenged, the matters are heard by a Division Bench of the High Court. We, therefore, request the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the High Court that as and when the writ petitions questioning the constitutionality of the Ordinance are filed, the same may be listed before a Division Bench. The matter under Article 227 No. 15949/2024 shall also thereafter be placed before the same Bench. However, the *interim* order(s) issued hereinabove shall continue to operate till the matter is decided finally by the High Court.

28. At this stage, we are reminded of the fact that the petitioners' challenge to the Ordinance will doubtlessly take some time in proper adjudication. We, therefore, deem it fit to stay operation of the Ordinance's provisions in the *interregnum*, only to the extent they grant the State powers to constitute a Trust for managing the Temple's affairs.

29. Consequently, the constitution of the Shree Bankey Bihar Ji Temple Trust, as defined in Section 3 of the Ordinance and its composition, as contained in Section 5, shall be kept in abeyance till the question of validity of the Ordinance (or any Act in relation thereto subsequently passed by the State Legislature), is finally resolved by the High Court.

30. We may hasten to add that this *interim* direction shall not preclude the State from ratification of the Ordinance in the State Assembly; though, such an exercise shall obviously be

subject to outcome of the proceedings for which the affected persons and the petitioners have been relegated to the High Court.

31. We are equally mindful that the sum of our directions shall effectively leave the management of the subject-Temple in limbo yet again, since the *ad-hoc* arrangement of Temple-management has been wholly ineffective and inefficient in discharging its duties over the years. We are pained to observe that the previous administerial deadlock(s) and in-fighting have only worsened the problems plaguing the Temple, causing much distress to the pilgrims – who are left without any amenities or redress.

32. The material on record indicates that despite the substantial donations received by the Temple running into hundreds of crores, no tangible steps appear to have been taken by the successive managements for providing essential facilities to the scores of devotees visiting the Temple. We are also informed that the Goswami Shebaits remain divided into factions and continue to litigate before the civil courts, further contributing to administrative inaction.

33. We are, therefore, satisfied that a High-Powered Managing Committee headed by an impartial person with considerable experience and ability is required to be constituted to run the day-to-day affairs of the Temple, apart from undertaking some of the initiatives, which we are illustratively mentioning in the latter part of this order. There is no gainsaying that the sanctity of safe religious pilgrimage shall never be unjustly denied to all the citizens of this country.

34. We are emboldened in this regard by the fair stand taken by the State before us, acquiescing to the establishment of a Committee for the management of the Temple. This Committee may deal with a variety of issues incidental to the proper functioning of the Temple, which include, but are not limited to, the provision of essential amenities such as clean drinking

water, functional washrooms, adequate shelter and seating, dedicated corridors for crowd movement, and special arrangements for the elderly, women, children, and persons with disabilities. Effective crowd control, safety protocols, and maintenance of public order during peak days and festivals are also integral to the responsible administration of the Temple, which sees exceptionally high daily footfall. The failure to address these aspects on an urgent basis not only endangers the safety of the devotees but also undermines the sanctity of the Temple itself.

35. We accordingly direct the establishment of a High-Powered Temple Management Committee (hereinafter, "the Committee") to oversee and supervise the day-to-day functioning inside and outside of the Temple, subject to the ultimate outcome of the proceedings before the High Court. Accordingly, we constitute the High-Powered Temple Management Committee comprising the following persons/authorities:

(i) **Shri Justice (Retd.) Ashok Kumar, Allahabad High Court; currently residing at Flat No. B/601, Raj Niwas Residency, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh (Mobile No.: +91 94152 36815); (Chairperson)**

(ii) **Shri Mukesh Mishra, Retired District & Sessions Judge, Uttar Pradesh Judiciary; currently residing at House No. 7-C/260, Sector 7, Awadh Vihar Yojana, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh; (Member)**

(iii) **District & Sessions Jugde, Mathura; (Member)**

(iv) **Munsif, Mathura/Civil Judge, Mathura; (Member)**

(v) **District Magistrate, Mathura/Collector, Mathura; (Member-cum-Member Secretary)**

(vi) **Senior Superintendent of Police, Mathura; (Member)**

(vii) **Municipal Commissioner, Mathura; (Member)**

(viii) **Vice Chairman, Mathura Vrindavan Development Authority; (Member)**

(ix) **A renowned Architect, to be engaged by the Chairperson; (Member)**

(x) **A representative from the Archaeological Survey of India; (Member)**

(xi) **2 Persons each from both the Goswami groups. (Members)**

36. As a necessary corollary to the Committee constituted hereinabove, we also pass the following directions:

i. **The Chairperson of the Committee shall be paid Rs. 2 lakhs per month as honorarium, which shall be borne from the accounts of the Temple fund. He shall also be provided all the requisite secretarial assistance, including but not limited to transportation facilities.**

ii. **Shri Mukesh Mishra, Member of the Committee, shall be paid Rs. 1 lakh per month as honorarium, which shall be borne from the accounts of the Temple fund.**

iii. **The Committee shall have an office at Mathura, for which the District Administration is directed to provide a suitable space forthwith, without any charges.**

iv. **The Deputy District Commissioner, Mathura; the Special Superintendent of Police, Mathura; and Principal Secy., Dharmarth Karya Vibhag, State of Uttar Pradesh are directed to meticulously comply with the instructions and recommendations that may be made by the Chairperson of the Committee from time to time.**

v. **The Committee shall make an endeavor to plan the holistic development of the Temple and its vicinity, for which they may privately negotiate suitable purchase of the requisite land. In case no such negotiation fructifies, the State**

Government is directed to proceed with acquisition of the required land in accordance with law.

vi. **It is made clear that besides the 4 Members in the Committee representing the Goswamis, no other Goswami or *sevayat* shall be associated or allowed to interfere or impede in any way in the managing of the Temple's critical functions, except in the practice of conducting *puja/sewa* and offering *prasad* to the deity.**

vii. **The various petitioners/applicants/intervenors before us who seem anxious regarding the proper functioning of the Temple – and have tendered various noteworthy suggestions regarding the same – are at liberty to move such recommendations before the Committee, which shall decide the same after due consideration.**

viii. **The Chairperson shall be the final authority on all matters regarding the Committee's functioning, including but not limited to its Rules of Procedure, scheduling of meetings, and other ancillary matters.**

37. A set of applicants before us has objected to certain suggestions put forth for the improvement of Temple-functioning, *inter alia* alleging violation of Article 300A or of Articles 48A and 51AG of the Constitution of India. We see absolutely no merit in these objections, at this stage, especially when we have granted liberty to challenge the Ordinance before the High Court. However, as we want to wholly sidestep any impediment in the effective functioning of the Committee, we decline to entertain these objections *in toto*.

38. As a measure of abundant caution, before parting with these petitions we reiterate that no opinion is expressed on the merits of the constitutional challenge to the impugned Ordinance, and all contentions are left open for the High Court to consider on their own merits, in accordance with law.

39. The High Court is requested to decide the controversy expeditiously and preferably within one year of the fresh writ petitions being filed.

40. In the event of any unforeseen impediment or difficulty, the Committee or the State shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application before this Court.

.....J.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

New Delhi
August 08, 2025

ITEM NO.36+37 COURT NO.2 SECTION X

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

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s).704/2025

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF THAKUR SHREE BANKEY BIHARI JI MAHARAJ TEMPLE & ANR. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS. Respondent(s)

(IA No. 174551/2025 - GRANT OF INTERIM RELIEF)

WITH
Diary No(s).28487/2025 (III-A)
(IA No. 132265/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No.175705/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 174436/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No. 137269/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.175479/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 174439/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 175910/2025 – INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No.174438/2025 – INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No.138791/2025 – INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 132254/2025 – MODIFICATION, IA No.176392/2025 - PERMISSION TO APPEAR AND ARGUE IN PERSON)

Diary No(s).29320/2025 (III-A)
(IA No. 136227/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No.136226/2025 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION)

W.P.(C) No.709/2025 (X)
(IA No. 176297/2025 - STAY APPLICATION)

Diary No(s).39950/2025 (III-A)
(IA No. 171914/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No.171918/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING, IA No. 175579/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING PAPER BOOKS, IA No. 175683/2025 – INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 171911/2025 - MODIFICATION)

Diary No(s).39984/2025 (III-A)
(IA No. 172160/2025 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION, IA No.174129/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING, IA No. 174132/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING PAPER BOOKS, IA No. 174618/2025 – INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT, IA No. 172155/2025 - MODIFICATION)

W.P.(C) No.707/2025 (X)
(IA No. 175803/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.175800/2025 - STAY APPLICATION)

W.P.(C) No.734/2025 (X)
(IA No. 182374/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.182372/2025

- STAY APPLICATION)

Item No.37

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s).752/2025
(IA No. 188783/2025 - STAY APPLICATION)

Date : 08-08-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Shivansh Bharatkumar Pandya , AOR

Mr. Gopal Sankarnararayan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prabhat Chaurasia, Adv.
Mr. Nitish Raj, Adv.
Mr. Mahek Maheshwari, Adv.
Ms. Smuriti Gangadhar, Adv.
Mr. Jasdeep Singh Dhillon, Adv.
Mr. Anirudh Jamwal, Adv.
Ms. Kenisha Savla, Adv.
M/s MPS Legal, AOR

Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goel, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Tanvi Dubey, AOR
Mr. Malak Bhatt, Adv.
Mr. Yash Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Rongon Choudhury, Adv.
Mr. Shaurya Rai, Adv.
Mr. Mekala Ganesh Kumar Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Vansh Chauhan, Adv.
Ms. Riddhi Jain, Adv.

Mr. Akash Vashishtha, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Upadhyay, AOR
Ms. Anukriti Bajpai, Adv.

Mr. Suhail Dutt, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Azhar Alam, Adv.
Ms. B. Vijayalakshmi Menon, AOR

Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Jha, AOR
Ms. Aparajita Jamwal, Adv.
Ms. Saushiraya Havelia, Adv.
Mr. Oleander D Singh, Adv.
Ms. Tanvi Anand, Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Tomar, Adv.

Mr. Amit Anand Tiwari, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pranjal Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Devyani Gupta, AOR

Mr. Avadh Bihar Kaushik, AOR
Mr. Vishnu Dutt Sharma, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. KM Nataraj, A.S.G.
Mr. Navin Pahwa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sharan Dev Singh Thakur, Sr. A.A.G.
Ms. Ruchira Goel, AOR
Ms. Indira Bhakar, Adv.
Ms. Veera Mahuli, Adv.
Mr. Sharanya Sinha, Adv.

Dr. A P Singh, Adv.
Mr. V P Singh, Adv.
Ms. Richa Singh, Adv.
Mr. Nihal Shekhawat, Adv.
Ms. Geeta Chauhan, Adv.
Ms. Pratima Rani, Adv.
Mr. Ashish Singh, Adv.
Mr. Sachin Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Kumar Srivastva, Adv.
Mr. Sadashiv, AOR

Ms. Shilpi Chowdhary, AOR
Mr. Narendra Kumar Goswami, Adv.
Mr. Amarkant Patel, Adv.

Ms. Vibha Datta Makhija, Sr. Adv.
Mr. A. Radhakrishnan, AOR
Mr. Shiv Kumar, Adv.
Ms. Vaishnavi, Adv.
Mr. Sujeet Rajan, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.

2. Permission to file miscellaneous applications is granted. Permission to appear and argue in-person is granted.

3. Applications for impleadment/intervention are allowed. Cause title be amended accordingly.

4. The Miscellaneous Applications are allowed and Writ Petitions

are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

5. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT) **(PREETHI T.C.)**
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS **ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

(signed order is placed on the file)