

ITEM NO.37

COURT NO.7

SECTION XII

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).3163-3164/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-01-2026 in WP No. 1416/2025 07-01-2026 in WP No. 2413/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras at Chennai]

BHAKTAVATSALAM EDUCATIONAL TRUST
THROUGH A VAMANAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DISTRICT COLLECTOR KANCHEEPURAM & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[TO BE TAKEN UP AS FIRST MATTER ON THE BOARD AT 10:30 A.M.]

IA No. 29050/2026 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 9962/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT

IA No. 9964/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 30202/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

IA No. 29037/2026 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT

IA No. 30201/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL
DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 9965/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE LENGTHY LIST OF DATES

Date : 19-03-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. C.A. Sundaram, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Arvind Srevatsa, Adv.
Mr. S. Santanam Swaminadhan, Adv.
Mr. Manuraj S., Adv.
Ms. Aarthi Rajan, AOR
Mr. Abhishek Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Abhilasha Shrawat, Adv.
Mr. Kartik Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Amar Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Kapil Sibal, Sr. Adv.
Mr. N.R. Elango, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR
Mr. Veshal Tyagi, Adv.
Ms. Jahnvi Taneja, Adv.

Mr. Agilesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. G R Deepak, Adv.
Mr. Vishnu Unnikrishnan, Adv.

Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Purnima Krishna, AOR
Mr. M.F. Philip, Adv.
Mr. Togin M. Babichen, Adv.
Mr. Karamveer Singh Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Raghavendra S. Srivatsa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Anish R. Shah, AOR
Mr. Ankit Sahu, Adv.

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

1. The petitioner before us is a Public Charitable Trust. The Trust is running a Polytechnic College.
2. *Prima facie*, it appears from the case put up by the petitioner that sometime in the year 1961, land to the extent of 73.43 acres was acquired by the State Government for the purpose of establishing this Polytechnic College.
3. It is not in dispute that the college has been established.
4. The controversy today revolves around as regards 19.03 acres of land out of 73.43 acres which was acquired at the relevant point of time.
5. For the time being, we are not entering into any debate insofar as the right of the petitioner to continue to be in possession of this disputed 19.03 acres of land. Although the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has many fold contentions to canvass in this regard. Yet, today we are

trying to find a way out so as to ensure that no prejudice is caused to either of the side.

6. The Municipal Corporation of Kancheepuram and the State wants to put up a bus stand on 10 acres of land out of this 19.03 acres of disputed land. This 19.03 acres has been classified as "*Thoppu Poramboke*".

7. It is the case of the petitioner that if bus stand comes up as planned by the Corporation and the State it is going to cause serious prejudice to the educational institution, more particularly, the students studying in this college. On the other hand, the *prima facie* case of the other side is that the petitioner has no say in this matter as they are no way concerned with this 19.03 acres of land classified as "*Thoppu Poramboke*".

8. At this stage, we must state that the petitioner has made itself clear that it does not want to come in the way of the Corporation and the State insofar as putting of the bus stand is concerned. However, according to the petitioner, the bus stand should be constructed at a place which would not cause any nuisance or inconvenience to the educational institution.

9. As regards the aforesaid, Mr. Sundaram, the learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner has put forward many suggestions. According to him, his client is ready and willing to part with 10 acres of land on the northern side of the National Highway No.48.

10. Both the sides have placed before us sketches of the subject land and the building details. We tried to understand

in what manner the bus stand is going to come up. We could also gather a fair idea as regards the existing building of the Polytechnic College.

11. We are of the view that this dispute between the parties can be resolved amicably.

12. Our suggestion as on date is that the petitioner may appoint one expert planner from their side. The State and the Corporation shall also appoint one planner from their side.

13. Let both these experts sit together and undertake a detailed survey of the land in question, the place where the bus stand is to come up and also suggest the alternative sites which may cause least inconvenience and prejudice to the educational institution.

14. Let this exercise be undertaken at the earliest. The experts will prepare an exhaustive report in this regard with appropriate sketches and photographs.

15. On the next date of hearing, we would request both the expert planners to personally remain present before this Court and furnish their report. We are requesting their physical presence in this Court so that if we want put some questions to them, we can accordingly ask them.

16. Post this matter for further hearing on 12.05.2026 at 03:00 PM.

17. On the next date of hearing, we shall proceed to hear the matter further.

18. Although the petitioner has offered the land on the northern side, that is, land abutting the National Highway

No.48 on the northern side, yet, according to Mr. P.S. Patwalia and Mr. Kapil Sibal, the learned senior counsel appearing for the Corporation and the State respectively, the town is on the southern side and in such circumstances, the passengers will be put to difficulty and the purpose of having a bus stand would be frustrated.

(HARPREET KAUR)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)