ITEM NO.24 COURT NO.4 SECTION XI

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

PETITION(S) FOR SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL (C) NO(S). 22934/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 06-05-2026 in CMAP No. 74848/2016 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench]

RIVER VIEW SAHKARI AWAS SAMITI LTD Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS. Respondent(s)

FOR ADMISSION
IA No. 190545/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

WITH
SLP(C) NO. 23145/2026 (XI)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No. 193106/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 16-11-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PAMIDIGHANTAM SRI NARASIMHA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK ARADHE

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Dinesh Dwivedi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. K. K. Mohan- 289, AOR
Mr. K. K. Mohan, AOR
Mr. Sachin Garg, Adv.
Mr. Nishant Singh, Adv.
Mr. Kushagra Bajpai, Adv.
Mr. Rajat Kumar Jha, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary- 1540, AOR
Mr. Lakhan Kumar Mishra, Adv.

Mr. Sachin Gupta- 2118, AOR
Ms. Mahima Chanchalani, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Pradhan, Adv.
Ms. Khyati Jain, Adv.
Ms. Anu Priya, Adv.
Mr. Saksham Rastogi, Adv.
Mr. Ajay, Adv.
Mr. Rajat Jain, Adv.
Ms. Diksha Modi, Adv.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by PRIYANKA KALIK
Date: 2026.11.18 10:33:56 IST
Reason:

Ms. Vanshika Sarraf, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The Special Leave Petitions are directed against the interim order dated 06.05.2026 passed by the High Court by which the application for impleadment filed by respondent nos.5 to 12, in a Writ Petition filed by the petitioner, has been allowed.

3. Mr. Dinesh Dwivedi, learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the subject matter of the petition pertains to the validity of Lucknow Development Authority's demand of Rs. 8.36 crores towards development charges and the reduction of the adjustment area under the State Policy. It is further submitted that the presence of respondent nos.5 to 12 is not necessary for the adjudication of the controversy involved in the petition as the *lis* is between the petitioner and the Lucknow Development Authority. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the order does not call for any interference.

4. We have considered the submissions made on both sides. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned order does not warrant any interference. However, the High Court while hearing respondent nos.5 to 12 shall bear in mind the scope of the Writ Petition and the reliefs prayed for by the petitioner in the Writ Petition.

5. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter.

6. Accordingly, the Special Leave Petitions are disposed of.

7. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(PRIYANKA MALIK)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(NIDHI WASON)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR