

ITEM NO.6

COURT NO.16

SECTION XV

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

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 21211/2012

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 25-05-2012 in DBCWP No. 6591/2011 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jodhpur]

BIRLA CORPORATION LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BHANWAR SINGH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 142082/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS
IA No. 140567/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 250208/2023 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 249754/2023 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 6/2017 - INTERVENTION APPLICATION
IA No. 61659/2022 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 251336/2023 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 22377/2012 (XV)

FOR ON IA 1904/2013

FOR ON IA 1/2013

(IA No. 189634/2024 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 50588/2017 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT)

SLP(C) No. 23551/2012 (XV)SLP(C) No. 25186/2012 (XV)SLP(C) No. 29698/2012 (XV)SLP(C) No. 31905/2013 (XV)SLP(C) No. 31724/2012 (XV)

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

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.V. ANJARIA

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Sarad Kumar Singhania, AOR

Mr. Praveen Kumar, AOR

Ms. Sunaina Kumar, Adv.

Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Kunal Vajani, Adv.
 Mr. Ankur Chawla, Adv.
 Mr. Kartikey Bhatt, AOR
 Mr. Aditya Samaddar, Adv.
 Mr. Mandeep Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Mohit Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Siddarth Seem, Adv.
 Ms. Rashi Mangal, Adv.

Mr. Ambar Qamaruddin, AOR

Mr. Neeraj Kumar Gupta, AOR
 Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Deval N Modi, Adv.
 Mr. Shivang Srivastava, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Irshad Ahmad, AOR
 Mr. Sarad Kumar Singhania, AOR
 Mr. Nikhil Jain, AOR
 M/S. Parekh & Co., AOR

Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
 Mr. Rishi Agrawala, Adv.
 Mr. Ankur Saigal, Adv.
 Ms. Vidisha Swarup, Adv.
 Mr. Naman Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

Mr. Milind Kumar, AOR

Mr. Siddhartha Dave, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Farrukh Rasheed, AOR
 Mr. Himanshu Tyagi, Adv.
 Ms. Shifa, Adv.

Ms. Pragati Neekhara, AOR

Mr. S.D Sanjay, A.S.G.
 Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, A.A.G.
 Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, AOR

Mr. Annam Venkatesh, AOR
 Mr. Rahul Mishra, Adv.
 Ms. Agrimaa Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Satyarth Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Tejaswani Upadhyay, Adv.
 Mr. Sunandan Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Mahesh Kasana, Adv.
 Ms. Aparna Rohatgi Jain, Adv.
 Mr. S. K. Verma, AOR

Mr. Simarpal Singh Sawhney, Adv.
 Mr. Aditya Singh, AOR

Mr. Neeraj Kumar Gupta, AOR
 Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Deval N Modi, Adv.
 Mr. Rahul Kumar Varma, Adv.
 Mr. Shivang Srivastawa, Adv.

Mr. Kartikey Bhatt, AOR

Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh, AOR
 Mr. Yatharth Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Aman Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Shashwat, Adv.
 Mr. Divyansh Singh, Adv.

Mr. Shashwat Parihar, Adv
 Mr. Sanjay Kumar Visen, AOR
 Ms. Ritu Rastogi, Adv.
 Mr./Ms. Ritambara, Adv.

Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Chitrangda Rastravara, Adv.
 Ms. Srishti Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Anirudh Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Abhijeet Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Aishwary Mishra, Adv.
 Mr. Dhananjai Shekhawat, Adv.
 Mr. Yuvraj Singh, Adv.
 Ms. Pearl Pundir, Adv.
 Ms. Anushikha Rathore, Adv.
 Mr. Dashrath Singh, Adv.
 Mr. Gp. Capt. Karan Singh Bhati, AOR

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

1. We have heard learned senior counsel for the parties.
2. Our attention to the response-affidavit of State of Rajasthan/respondent No. 8 has been invited.
3. Learned Additional Solicitor General, Mr. S.D Sanjay, requests

reasonable time to place on record the report of the Committee, said to have been made, upon due deliberation and examination of all the reports available in this behalf.

4. Learned senior counsel for the respondent(s), Ms. Ruchi Kohli, submits that the persons interested in preserving the subject structure, in fact, have a few objections and equal number of suggestions for preserving Chittorgarh Fort for posterity.

5. Mr. Shyam Divan, learned senior counsel for the petitioner argues that a decision by the State Government on the material available in this behalf is taken and the same is placed before the Court.

6. Considering the importance of the issue, we notice that the respondents, including the State, will have to take a firm stand from the material available on record, including the inputs from the intervener(s). The stand of the State Government that they will abide by the directions of this Court is appreciated but a candid and categorical stand could properly help the Court from resolving a long pending controversy. For, in matters of this nature, the State is the authority finally responsible for preserving archeologically important structures.

7. The parties, including interveners, are given two weeks' time from today to file their objections/suggestions before the Chief Secretary (Mining), State of Rajasthan and the State Government would examine every aspect, file its categorical view on the area needed to be prohibited from activity including blasting, and the area in which blasting activity can go forward.

8. The Chief Secretary is given liberty to decide whether an

opportunity of hearing should be afforded to the parties, including the intervener(s).

9. List on 08.09.2026.

(LOKESH ARORA)
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(NIDHI MATHUR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)