

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Writ Miscellaneous Application No. 204/2026

M/s Jsw Cement Limited, Registered Office, Jsw Centre, Bandra Kurla Complex, Bandra (East), Mumbai 400051, Maharashtra, India Cement Production And Limestone, Mines Lease 3B2 Limestone Block N/v Sarasani Tehsil And District Nagaur Through Authorized Representative Varindra Singh Saini S/o Sardar Mohan Singh Saini, Aged 52 Years, Hoshiarpur, Punjab, Associate President, Jsw Cement Limited, Hall Spice Hotel, 1st Floor, Opposite Br Mirdha Government College, Nagaur, Tehsil And District Nagaur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. Urmila D/o Jasnath, W/o Omnath, R/o Harima Tehsil, Nagaur District, Rajasthan.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Tehsildar Nagaur, District Nagaur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Vikas Balia, Sr. Advocate assisted by Mr. Akshay Nagori. Mr. Veyankatesh Garg.
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Manohar Singh Rathore.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Order

05/05/2026

1. Present miscellaneous application has been filed seeking further directions / clarification with respect to order dated 18.03.2026 passed by this Court for seeking extension of time stipulated in said order.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant submitted that, vide order dated 18.03.2026, this Court, considering that the issue pertains to a development project requiring time-bound adjudication,

disposed of writ petition with a direction to parties to remain present before learned Board of Revenue on 23.03.2026. Further directions were issued to learned Board of Revenue to ensure disposal of revision petitions within a period of 21 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of said order.

2.1 It is submitted that although directions for expeditious disposal of revision petitions were issued vide said order dated 18.03.2026, however, subsequent developments in the matter, particularly the conduct of respondents, have rendered the implementation of said directions ineffective.

2.2 Explaining the background facts, learned counsel for the applicant submitted that applicant - petitioner company is running a cement plant and additional land including land in question was required for the purposes of establishing conveyor belt, which is an essential ancillary mode of transportation of goods, for which application under Section 89 of the Rajasthan Land Revenue Act ("*L.R. Act*") was filed.

2.3 It is stated that although almost all landholders have given their consent and accepted the amount of compensation determined in accordance with the provisions of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 ("*RFCTLARR Act, 2013*"); however, respondents have not accepted the same and have instead contested aforesaid application under Section 89 of the L.R. Act, which remains pending consideration before Court of Learned Additional District Collector, Nagaur. It is also contented that during pendency of said application, respondents have sold part of

land to third parties with the sole intent of frustrating the proceedings.

2.4 Applicant, upon becoming aware of such transfers, filed applications under Order I Rule 10 CPC and Order VI Rule 17 CPC seeking impleadment of subsequent purchasers as party respondents and also sought necessary amendments incorporating relevant averments regarding transfer and change in mutation of the land in favour of subsequent purchasers. Said application was allowed by learned Additional District Collector, Nagaur, vide order dated 13.02.2026.

2.5 Learned counsel stated that respondents have adopted dilatory tactics, which is evident from the fact that they challenged aforesaid order dated 13.02.2026 by filing a revision petition before learned Board of Revenue, wherein an interim order dated 18.02.2026 was passed. Said interim order was challenged before this Court by way of original writ petition.

2.6 Considering the facts of the case and the nature of the project involved, and with a view to avoid adjudication on merits at that stage, this Court, vide order dated 18.03.2026, declined to interfere with the ad-interim relief granted in favour of respondent No.1, but directed learned Board of Revenue to decide the revision petition expeditiously. Pursuant thereto, the parties appeared before learned Board of Revenue on 23.03.2026 and placed the certified copy of said order on record.

2.7 On 25.03.2026, learned Board of Revenue requisitioned record from the Court of learned Additional District Collector, Nagaur, and the matter was listed for 06.04.2026. On that date, matter could not be taken up due to a condolence reference for a

Member of the Board of Revenue. Thereafter, the matter was listed on 10.04.2026 and an adjournment was sought on behalf of respondents citing non-availability of arguing counsel. During this period, the subsequent purchasers also moved an application under Order I Rule 10 CPC seeking impleadment in the revision petition, as they had not been impleaded therein by the respondents. The matter was thereafter listed for 15.04.2026.

2.8 To the utter surprise of applicant – petitioner company, it was discovered that although the matter was originally fixed for 15.04.2026, however, date had been manually altered to 15.05.2026, i.e., after a period of 35 days, in complete disregard of the directions issued by this Court for time-bound disposal. Notably, the stipulated time period of 21 days had already expired on 13.04.2026.

2.9 In these circumstances, applicant-petitioner company preferred present application. In the meantime, applicant-petitioner company also moved an application for early listing before learned Board of Revenue, which was allowed and the matter was kept on 04.05.2026. On that date, arguments on the application filed under Order I Rule 10 CPC by the subsequent purchasers were heard.

2.10 Learned counsel for the applicant submits that respondents have consistently adopted dilatory tactics to delay the proceedings for one or the other reason. It is emphasized that although the applicant had already secured impleadment of subsequent purchasers in original proceedings under Section 89 of the L.R. Act, the respondents deliberately not impleaded them in the revision petition. Subsequent purchasers thus filed their own

impleadment application, which is now being opposed by the original khatedars (revision petitioners).

2.11 It is further submitted that despite specific directions issued by this Court to decide pending revision petitions within 21 days, more than 50 days have lapsed, but the revision petitions have not yet been heard on merits.

2.12 In view of the above, learned counsel for the applicant prayed that order dated 18.03.2026 be modified to extend the time for disposal along with issuance of appropriate directions to learned Board of Revenue to ensure expeditious adjudication.

3. Aforesaid factual submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner have not been disputed by learned counsel for the respondents. However, it is contended that no unnecessary adjournments have been sought by respondents and that the delay in disposal of the revision petitions is purely procedural in nature.

4. After considering the submissions made on behalf of the parties and upon perusal of the order sheets of the revision proceedings, this Court finds that directions issued by this Court for expeditious disposal of revision petitions have not been followed, either in letter or in spirit. It is indeed borne out from the record that the application for impleadment of subsequent purchasers was moved after order dated 18.03.2026 was passed by this Court, however, it is also evident that said purchasers had already been impleaded as party respondents in original proceedings but respondent failed to implead them in the revision petition for reasons best known to them. In fact, no cogent grounds are discernible for opposing the impleadment application

filed before the learned Board of Revenue but the same appears to be aimed solely at delaying the proceedings.

5. This Court has also perused the order sheet dated 10.04.2025 passed by learned Board of Revenue, wherein the matter was initially fixed to be listed for 15.04.2026, however, by way of a manual alteration in the order sheet, the date was shifted to a later date by nearly one month, despite the clear directions issued by this Court for time-bound disposal of the matter.

6. Having regard to the peculiar facts of the case, and considering that the matter pertains to a development project, this Court is of the considered view that its directions ought not to have been treated in a casual or indifferent manner. This Court had categorically directed the learned Board of Revenue to ensure expeditious disposal of the revision petitions without granting unnecessary adjournments to either party. In this backdrop, this Court strongly deprecates the dilatory tactics adopted by the respondents.

7. In view of the foregoing discussion and for the reasons recorded hereinabove, this Court deems it appropriate to allow the present application. Learned Board of Revenue is directed to take up the revision petitions on priority basis and in an expeditious manner. Time period for disposal of revision petitions is hereby extended by a further period of 21 days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

8. It is made clear that no unnecessary adjournments shall be granted to either of the parties, and learned Board of Revenue shall endeavour to conclude the proceedings, within time frame

prescribed in present order and if required, conduct the proceedings on a day-to-day basis.

9. It is made clear that learned Board of Revenue shall decide the revision petitions independently, strictly in accordance with law, without being influenced by any observations made in this order.

10. With the aforesaid observations and directions, present miscellaneous application stands disposed of.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J