

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13362 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 19946/2024]

BABU RAM

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HIMACHAL PRADESH & ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13363 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 19370/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13364 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20207/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13365 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20829/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13366 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20266/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13367 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20474/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13368 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25444/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13369 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 19912/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13370 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 19945/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13371 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20521/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13372 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 20522/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13373 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 21159/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13374 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 22383/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13375 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 21936/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13376 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 21739/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13377 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 22556/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13378 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 24580/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13379 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25568/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13380 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25540/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13381 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25360/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13382 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 28476 of 2024 @ DY. NO. 47646 OF 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13383 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 26164 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13384 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25766 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13385 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25524 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13386 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25525 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13387 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25558 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13388 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25751 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13389 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25768 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13390 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25903 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13391 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 25912 of 2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13351 OF 2024
(Arising out of SLP(C) NO.28475/2024 @ DY. NO. 51199/2024)

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13352 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 27263/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 13353-54 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 26594-26595/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13355 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 28129/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13356 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 28133/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13357 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 28135/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13358 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 27021/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. 13359-61 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 27170-27172/2024]

AND

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 13392 OF 2024
[Arising out of SLP (C) No. 27061/2024]

ORDER

1. Permission to file special leave petition in SLP (c) Dy No. 47646/2024 is granted.
2. Delay in filing application(s) for setting aside abatement is condoned. Abatement is set aside. Application(s) for Substitution are allowed.
3. Leave granted.
4. Since issues of law and fact in this batch of appeals are identical, we propose to dispose of the same by this common judgment and order.
5. These appeals arise out of orders passed in eviction proceedings under the Himachal Pradesh Public Premises and Land (Eviction and Rent Recovery) Act, 1971¹. All the appellants suffered findings that they were in unauthorized occupation of 'forest land'. Eviction orders passed under Section 5 of the 1971 Act recording such findings together with appellate orders passed under section 9 thereof dismissing the appeals carried from such orders were the subject matter of challenge in separate writ petitions instituted before the High Court of Himachal Pradesh at Shimla² at the instance of individuals who were declared unauthorized occupants of public land and facing imminent threat of eviction. By orders of varying dates, the High Court dismissed the writ petitions and made certain consequential directions. Orders of dismissal of the writ petitions are challenged in these civil appeals.

¹ 1971 Act

² High Court

6. The civil appeal arising out of SLP (C) No. 19946/2024 titled *Babu Ram Vs. State of Himachal Pradesh* has been argued as the lead case by Mr. Neeraj Sharma, learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant³ and Mr. Anup Kumar Rattan, learned Advocate General appearing for the State of Himachal Pradesh. We have heard them at some length.

7. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that all the orders of eviction were based on a purported demarcation report which, according to Babu Ram and the other appellants, was prepared without notice to them. *Per contra*, the stand of the respondent-State is that all the appellants were informed verbally of the proposed exercise to demarcate forest lands and that despite being aware, they did not participate in such exercise.

8. Be that as it may, once notice under section 4 of the 1971 Act was issued, Babu Ram responded thereto by raising a contention that he has not been in unauthorized occupation of any forest land. He also contended that he was in occupation of the subject land since long and that the land under his occupation being Government land, he is entitled to the protection of regularization in terms of the provisions contained in section 163A of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1954 and the Rules framed thereunder.

9. The Collector-cum-Assistant Conservator of Forests, Rampur Bushahr, Himachal Pradesh⁴, upon consideration of the response of Babu Ram to the show cause notice, the evidence led by the parties and upon hearing them proceeded to pass an order dated 7th November, 2015. The concluding portion thereof recorded that for the “aforementioned reasons”, the Collector was of the opinion that Babu Ram was in unauthorized occupation of forest land and that he required to be evicted within thirty days from date of receipt of the

³ Babu Ram

⁴ Collector

order.

10. We have read the order dated 7th November, 2015 in between the lines to trace the reasons premised whereon Babu Ram was identified as an unauthorized occupant of forest land. The order, *inter alia*, records preparation of a challan put up by the Range Forest Officer, Nankhari before the Collector alleging that Babu Ram was in unauthorized occupation of forest land as the starting point based whereon notice under section 4 of the 1971 Act was issued. The order then records the various dates on which the proceedings were conducted by the Collector in course whereof Babu Ram appeared with his witnesses and their statements were recorded. This was followed by recording that written arguments on behalf of the State had been filed and the case finally heard on 7th November, 2015. On that very date, as noticed above, the final order of eviction was passed for the “aforementioned reasons” and requiring Babu Ram’s eviction. The order does not record anything more.

11. There is no reason, far less cogent and tenable reason, appearing on the face of the order of the Collector. Such order merely records the various stages through which the proceedings passed and the Collector’s *ipse dixit* that Babu Ram is an unauthorized occupant of forest land. The order of the Collector does not meet the standards of a speaking order that could be regarded as valid. The same does not record what the claims and counter claims are. Why the evidence adduced by one party was preferred to the evidence adduced by the other is conspicuous by its absence. In fact, there is no discussion of the evidence at all. Adverting to the materials on record showing application of mind was the minimum which was required of the Collector while he proceeded to adjudicate proceedings, though administrative in nature, but was obliged to act quasi-judicially. The order, without a doubt, is clearly in breach of principles of natural justice and principles of fairness in administrative action.

12. In making the above observations, we draw inspiration from the decision of this Court in **Anil Kumar vs. Presiding Officer**⁵ wherein, dealing with an inquiry report in connection with a disciplinary proceeding, this Court had the occasion to find similar flaws and lapses. The relevant passage reads as follows:

“5. We have extracted the charges framed against the appellant. We have also pointed out in clear terms the report of the Enquiry Officer. It is well-settled that a disciplinary enquiry has to be a quasi-judicial enquiry held according to the principles of natural justice and the Enquiry Officer has a duty to act judicially. The Enquiry Officer did not apply his mind to the evidence. Save setting out the names of the witnesses, he did not discuss the evidence. He merely recorded his ipse dixit that the charges are proved. He did not assign a single reason why the evidence produced by the appellant did not appeal to him or was considered not credit-worthy. He did not permit a peep into his mind as to why the evidence produced by the management appealed to him in preference to the evidence produced by the appellant. An enquiry report in a quasi-judicial enquiry must show the reasons for the conclusion. It cannot be an ipse dixit of the Enquiry Officer. It has to be a speaking order in the sense that the conclusion is supported by reasons. This is too well-settled to be supported by a precedent. In *Madhya Pradesh Industries Ltd. v. Union of India*⁶, this Court observed that a speaking order will at best be a reasonable and at its worst be at least a plausible one. The public should not be deprived of this only safeguard. Similarly in *Mahabir Prasad Santosh Kumar v. State of Uttar Pradesh*⁷, this Court reiterated that satisfactory decision of a disputed claim may be reached only if it be supported by the most cogent reasons that appealed to the authority. It should all the more be so where the quasi-judicial enquiry may result in deprivation of livelihood or attach a stigma to the character. In this case the enquiry report is an order sheet which merely produces the stage through which the enquiry passed. It clearly disclosed a total non-application of mind and it is this report on which the General Manager acted in terminating the service of the appellant. There could not have been a gross case of non-application of mind and it is such an enquiry which has found favour with the Labour Court and the High Court.”

13. The order of the Divisional Commissioner being the Appellate Authority who was approached by Babu Ram while laying a challenge to the order dated 7th November, 2015 of the Collector, fares no better. The Divisional

⁵ (1985) 3 SCC 378

⁶ (1966) 1 SCR 466

⁷ (1970) 1 SCC 764

Commissioner in the penultimate paragraph of his order dated 08th September, 2016 recorded that the Collector by a “speaking order” had directed eviction of unauthorized occupants. There can be no two opinions that the Divisional Commissioner too failed to apply his mind.

14. Having regard to what we have observed above, the order of the Collector falls totally short of a being a “speaking order” and this finding of the Commissioner is clearly indefensible.

15. We are a little surprised that these infirmities in the original order of eviction as well as the appellate order went unnoticed by the High Court, which proceeded to dismiss the writ petition of Babu Ram. Reasonable and adequate opportunity of defence not having been extended, we have not the slightest hesitation to set aside the original order of eviction, the appellate order and the order of the High Court dismissing the writ petition. Ordered accordingly.

16. Since all the other appellants stand on similar footing as Babu Ram, they are also entitled to similar relief. The orders impugned in their civil appeals also stand set aside.

17. However, it cannot be gainsaid that a citizen has no right to encroach public land. If indeed any citizen has encroached public land and such encroachment is not otherwise entitled to be regularized under any law, a citizen has no right to sit on public land. In such a case, the minimum safeguard that is required of the State while ordering eviction of an alleged unauthorized occupant is to follow a fair procedure which would, *inter alia*, include a proper exercise conducted for demarcation of the land in the presence of the party who is likely to be affected if an order of eviction were passed, a proper show cause notice under section 4 of the 1971 Act indicating the ground(s) on which action is proposed, which must be served together with any document that the State desires to rely on during the course of the eviction proceedings, a just and

proper consideration of the response of the noticee to the show cause notice, sufficient opportunity to lead evidence, and application of mind to all the materials on record leading to an order of eviction, if at all, it is required to be passed. If an appeal is preferred, it is needless to observe that the provisions of the 1971 Act governing disposal of such appeals also need to be adhered to strictly apart from natural justice principles.

18. In the light of the above, we direct and order that the respondent-State, through its appropriate department, will undertake an appropriate exercise for demarcation of forest land upon written notice to Babu Ram. It would be desirable if such an exercise is completed as early as possible, preferably within two months from date. Similar such exercise shall be conducted in respect of the other appellants who are also alleged to be in occupation of forest land, unauthorizedly.

19. If the event of any of the appellants, despite being served written notice, abstaining from attending the proceedings, the exercise of demarcation shall proceed *ex-parte* against him. The report of demarcation shall be served on each of the alleged unauthorised occupants of forest land, if the respondent-State proposes to proceed against them under Section 4 of the 1971 Act. The noticees shall be granted a fortnight's time to respond whereafter, the Collector shall take the proceedings to its logical conclusion in consonance with law as well as in the manner observed in this judgment within such further time as may be found necessary and reasonable by him.

20. If an order of eviction is passed, the same must be a speaking order. The unauthorized occupant(s) in such case shall be at liberty to work out his/their remedy(s) in accordance with the other provisions of the 1971 Act.

21. Since the appellants were dispossessed of their structures prior to filing of the special leave petitions giving rise to these civil appeals, *status-quo ante* as

prevailing on the date the writ petitions were instituted before the High Court shall be restored which shall, however, be subject to and abide by further orders that might be passed in freshly initiated eviction proceedings.

22. All contentions on merit are kept open for being urged before the appropriate authority.

23. The civil appeals preferred by Babu Ram and the other appellants stand disposed of on the above said terms.

.....J
[DIPANKAR DATTA]

.....J
[PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA]

**NEW DELHI;
NOVEMBER 28, 2024.**

ITEM NOS.50+46+47+48+49+51 COURT NO.16

SECTION XIV

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. 19946/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 22-07-2024 in CWP No. 2921/2016 passed by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh at Shimla]

BABU RAM

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HIMACHAL PRADESH & ANR.

Respondent(s)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 19370/2024 (XIV)
 (I.A. No. 240505/2024 - STAY APPLICATION))

SLP(C) No. 20207/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON I.A.208198/2024 AND FOR
 CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON IA 236833/2024)

SLP(C) No. 20829/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON IA
 236837/2024)

SLP(C) No. 20266/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 208202/2024 AND FOR
 CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON IA 236839/2024)

SLP(C) No. 20474/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 208203/2024 AND FOR
 CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON IA 236834/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25444/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 208200/2024 AND FOR
 CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON IA 236824/2024)

SLP(C) No. 19912/2024 (XIV)

SLP(C) No. 19945/2024 (XIV)

SLP(C) No. 20521/2024 (XIV)
 (FOR PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..), IA 194116/2024
 FOR SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT ON IA 194117/2024, FOR APPLICATION
 FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING
 ASIDE THE ABATEMENT ON I.A. 194118/2024 AND FOR APPLICATION FOR
 SUBSTITUTION ON IA 194119/2024)

SLP(C) No. 20522/2024 (XIV)
 (IA No. 194938/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 21159/2024 (XIV)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 207180/2024, FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 213405/2024, FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 213406/2024)

SLP(C) No. 22383/2024 (XIV)

(FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE SPARE COPIES ON I.A 237147/2024)

SLP(C) No. 21936/2024 (XIV)

(I.A. No. 216198/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. AND IA No. 216197/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

SLP(C) No. 21739/2024 (XIV)

(I.A. No. 213017/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND I.A No. 213012/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 22556/2024 (XIV)

(FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON I.A. 222328/2024, FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON I.A. 222329/2024 AND FOR STAY APPLICATION ON IA 241919/2024)

SLP(C) No. 24580/2024 (XIV)

(FOR ADMISSION)

SLP(C) No. 25568/2024 (XIV)

(FOR ADMISSION)

SLP(C) No. 25540/2024 (XIV)

(FOR ADMISSION)

SLP(C) No. 25360/2024 (XIV)

(FOR ADMISSION)

Diary No(s). 47646/2024 (XIV)

(I.A FOR PERMISSION TO FILE PETITION (SLP/TP/WP/..) ON IA 240934/2024, FOR APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION ON IA 240940/2024, FOR APPLICATION FOR ABATEMENT ON IA 240947/2024, FOR APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT ON IA 240949/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 240951/2024)

SLP(C) No. 26164/2024 (XIV)

(FOR ADMISSION and I.R.)

SLP(C) No. 25766/2024 (XIV)

(FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 248748/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 248749/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25524/2024 (XIV)
(FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 247105/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 247106/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25525/2024 (XIV)
(I.A.FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 247104/2024, FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 247107/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 247109/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25558/2024 (XIV)
(I.A.FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 247458/2024, FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 247459/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT ON IA 247460/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25751/2024 (XIV)
(FOR PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES ON IA 248581/2024 AND FOR EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. ON IA 248582/2024)

SLP(C) No. 25768/2024 (XIV)
(IA No. 248759/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA No. 248758/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 25903/2024 (XIV)
(IA No. 250277/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT AND IA No. 250276/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 25912/2024 (XIV)
(FOR ADMISSION)

DY. NO. 51199/2025 (ITEM NO. 46)

SLP (C) NO. 27263/2024 (ITEM NO. 47)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.263761/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP (C) NOS. 26594-26595/2024) (ITEM NO. 48)
(I.A. No.256483/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT and IA No.256484/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 28129/2024 (XIV)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.258255/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.258254/2024-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 28133/2024 (XIV)
(FOR ADMISSION and I.R. and IA No.258880/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.258879/2024-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 28135/2024 (XIV)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.260374/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and
I.A No.260379/2024-CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE
DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 27021/2024 (XIV)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.261523/2024-APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION
and IA No.261524/2024-SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT and IA
No.261522/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. and IA No.261525/2024-
APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR
SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT)

SLP (C) Nos. 27170-27172/2024 (ITEM NO. 49)
(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.262344/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP (C) No.27061/2024 (item no. 51)
(FOR ADMISSION)

Date : 28-11-2024 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRASHANT KUMAR MISHRA

For Petitioner(s) **Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Sr. Adv.**
Mr. Shivam Prashar, Adv.
Mr. Amol Chitravanshi, AOR

Mr. Mool Singh, Adv.
Mr. Kailas Bajirao Autade, AOR

Mr. Bhupender Singh, AOR

Mr. Nishant Kumar, AOR

Mr. Alok Vajpayee, AOR

Mr. Naresh Kumar Tomar, Adv.
Mr. Rajeev Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Parminder Singh Bhullar, AOR

Mr. Ajay Marwah, AOR
Mr. Swaroopananda Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Parantap Singh, Adv.
Ms. Tajender Viridi, Adv.
Mr. Swaroopanada Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Tajinder Viridi, Adv.
Mr. Tarun Rajput, Adv.
Mr. Mrigank Bhardwaj, Adv.
Mr. Mirgank Bharwaj, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Shukla, Adv.

Mr. Gourave Kumar Agarwal, AOR

**Mr. Abhinav Mukerji, Sr. Adv.
Mrs. Bihu Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Vikrant Thakur, Adv.
Ms. Khushboo Hora, Adv.
Ms. Archita Nigam, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Singh Guleria, Adv.
Ms. Mrinal Gopal Elker, AOR**

**For Respondent(s) Mr. Anup Kumar Rattan, A.G.
Mr. Arman Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Shimpy Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Vishwanathan Iyer, Adv.
Ms. Alexandra Celestine, Adv.
Mr. Puneet Rasta, Adv.
Ms. Swati Daraik, Adv.
Mr. Shalab Thakur, Adv.
Ms. Anuradha Arputham, AOR**

**Mr. Divyanshu Kumar Srivastava, AOR
Mr. Yash Jain, Adv.**

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

1. Permission to file special leave petition in SLP (c) Dy No. 47646/2024 is granted.
2. Delay in filing application(s) for setting aside abatement is condoned. Abatement is set aside. Application(s) for Substitution are allowed.
- 3 Leave granted.
4. The civil appeals preferred by Babu Ram and the other appellants stand disposed of in terms of signed order.
5. Pending application(s) shall also stand disposed of.

**(RAJNI MUKHI)
COURT MASTER (SH)**

**(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)**

(Signed order is placed on the file)