

ITEM NO.16

COURT NO.1

SECTION III

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

CONTEMPT PETITION (CIVIL)Diary No(s). 62801/2025 in Contempt
Petition (C) Nos.237-239/2000

M/S PARAG CONSTRUCTION (NOW DUBE CONSTRUCTIONS) Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SANDHYA NANDEDKAR & ORS. Respondent(s)

[ONLY IA No. 69321/26 AND D.No. 38623/2025 ARE LISTED UNDER THIS
ITEM]

IA No. 69321/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS
WITH

Diary No(s). 38623/2025 (III)

[FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING ON IA 181622/2025

FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 181623/2025

FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 98888/2026

IA No. 98888/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 181622/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

IA No. 181623/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 28-07-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR
 Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.
 Ms. Madhulika, Adv.
 Mr. Amulya Dev Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Shriji Mishra, Adv.

Mr. R.P. Bhatt, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Anand Sukumar, Adv.
Mr. S.Sukumaran, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Patil, Adv.
Mr. Bhupesh Kumar Pathak, Adv.
Mrs. Ruche Anand, Adv.
Ms. Meera Mathur, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. R.P. Bhatt, Sr.Adv.
 Mr. Anand Sukumar, AOR
 Mr. S.Sukumaran, Adv.
 Mr. Sandeep Patil, Adv.
 Mr. Bhupesh Kumar Pathak, Adv.
 Mrs. Ruche Anand, Adv.

Mr. Gopal Jain, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Naman Saraswat, Adv.

Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR
Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Madhulika, Adv.
Mr. Amulya Dev Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Shriji Mishra, Adv.

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

1. A xerox copy of Note dated 10.07.2026 has been placed on record. As per the said Note, the Project Proponent has requested three months to complete the pending work from the date of shifting of transformer due to ongoing monsoon.
2. Mr. R.P. Bhatt, learned Senior Counsel for the Corporation as well as Mr. Gopal Jain, learned Senior Counsel, who has entered appearance on behalf of BEST, similarly submit that the pending work will be completed within three months. They request that the matter may be taken up after the aforementioned period.
3. Mr. Bhatt further informs us that although notices against the encroachers were issued under the Maharashtra Regional & Town Planning Act, 1966, most of them dragged the Corporation into litigation before the Civil Court.
4. In our considered opinion, in the absence of any *interim* stay by the Civil Court, nothing precludes the Corporation from taking those notices for removal of unauthorised possession to their logical conclusion(s).
5. Let the needful be done within a period of three months, and a Compliance Report be filed in this regard before the next date of hearing.
6. Post these matters for further consideration on 03.11.2026.

(SATISH KUMAR YADAV)
ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

