

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petitions for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 24271-24277/2026

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 6844/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 6846/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 6848/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 6849/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 8039/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 8045/2026 15-07-2026 in W.P.(C) No. 8046/2026 passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi]

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

E TRAV TECH LIMITED & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 203847/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 20-07-2026 This matter was 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. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General
Mr. K M Nataraj, A.S.G.
Mr. Sudarshan Lamba, AOR
Mr. Rajan Kumar Choursia, Adv.
Ms. Nasadiya Singh, Adv.
Mrs. Prerna Dhall, Adv.
Mr. Aman Mehta, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Danish Iqbal, Adv.
Mr. Kunwar Abhishek Singh, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Arjun Raghavendra M, Adv.
Mr. Dhaval Deshpande, Adv.
Mr. Amir Arsiwala, AOR
Mr. Stephen George, Adv.
Mr. Vivek Ram, Adv.
Mr. Kaushik, Adv.

Ms. Saumya Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Srija Choudhury, AOR

Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Kaadambari Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Faisal Sherwani, AOR
Mr. Saket Sikri, Adv.
Mr. Nakul Sachdeva, Adv.
Mr. Shreyansh Rathi, Adv.
Mr. Sagar Arora, Adv.
Mr. Abhinandan Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Shrinkhla Tiwari, Adv.
Mr. Karan Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Ankur Singhal, Adv.
Ms. Sumedha Sarkar, Adv.
Ms. Samkiti Jain, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Pal Khullar, Adv.
Mr. Sanket Sahu, Adv.

Mr. Avishkar Singhvi, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka Sethia, Adv.
Mr. Shravanth Shanker, Adv.
Ms. Poonam Shekhawat, Adv.
Ms. Prerna Robin, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Haris Beeran, Adv.
Mr. Akshal Malpani, Adv.
Mr. Usman Ghani Khan, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Heard learned senior counsel/counsel for the parties.
2. In our considered opinion, no interference in the impugned judgment of the High Court is called for. The Special Leave Petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.
3. However, in order to ensure that no impediment in the day-to-day functioning is caused till the directions issued by the High Court are complied with, paragraph No.101 of the impugned judgment is modified to the limited extent that the Union of India (Ministry of External Affairs) shall be at liberty to

(i) either allow the existing incumbents to provide the subject services across all four missions till fresh RFP is

issued and work is allotted to the successful bidder(s), at their own risk and without claiming any equity; or

(ii) temporarily allocate the work in all or any one of the four missions to the successful bidders, whose allotment has been set aside by the High Court through the impugned judgement, on the basis that this would be a temporary arrangement at its own risk and subject to the outcome of the fresh allocation exercise; or

(iii) evolve any other mechanism for the purpose of providing services in the four missions in the manner as it may deem appropriate, till the fresh allocation of work in accordance with the directions issued by the High Court is concluded.

4. We direct the Union of India (Ministry of External Affairs) to comply with the High Court directions as early as possible, but not later than three months.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR