

ITEM NO.19

COURT NO.1

SECTION XII-A

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).7366-7367/2010

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 26-02-2010 in WP No. 25910/2009 26-02-2010 in WP No. 26083/2009 26-02-2010 in WP No. 25910/2009 26-02-2010 in WP No. 26083/2009 passed by the High Court of A.P. at Hyderabad)

GOVT.OF A.P. & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

M/S OBULAPURAM MINIG.CO.P.LTD. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 59533/2019 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

IA No. 6525/2019 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION

IA No. 127920/2017 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION

IA No. 6522/2019 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT

IA No. 127918/2017 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT

Date : 21-07-2022 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. T. V. Ratnam, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr.Adv.  
Mr. Parmatma Singh, AOR

Mr. K.M. Natraj, ASG  
Ms. V.Mohana, Sr.Adv.  
Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, Adv.  
Ms. Saudamini Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Basava Prabhu S.Patil, Sr.Adv.  
Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR  
Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Anupam Ngangom, Adv.  
Mr. Wahengbam Immanuel Meitei, Adv.

Mr. Sunil Kumar Jain, AOR

Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

Mr. G.V.R. Chaudhary, Adv.  
Mr. Akhilkeshwar Jha, Adv.  
Mr. K. Shivraj Choudhuri, AOR

M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR

Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR

Mr. P. V. Dinesh, AOR  
Mr. Ashwini Kumar Singh, Adv.  
Mr. Bineesh K., Adv.

Dr. Joseph Aristotle S., AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. E.Vinay Kumar, Adv.  
Mr. S.Ashok Reddy, Adv.  
Mr. T.L. V.Rama Chari, Adv.

Mr. Mahfooz A. Nazki, AOR  
Mr. Polanki Gowtham, Adv.  
Mr. Shaik Mohamad Haneef, Adv.  
Mr. T. Vijaya Bhaskar Reddy, Adv.  
Mr. K.V. Girish Chowdary, Adv.  
Ms. Rajeswari Mukerjee, Adv.

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

1. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties and carefully perused the material placed on record.
2. It is submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Andhra Pradesh as also learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Union of India that the Report submitted by the Surveyor General of India has been accepted and the demarcation of the boundaries between the States of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka had taken place. Learned counsel further submits that the signatures on behalf of the State of Andhra Pradesh have already been obtained on the Map and the signatures on behalf of the State of Karnataka have yet to be obtained.

3. Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent - M/s Obulapuram Mining Co.Pvt.Ltd. submits that mining activities had been stopped on account of the boundary dispute raised by the State of Andhra Pradesh. Now that demarcation of the boundaries between the two States had taken place, his client may be allowed to restart the mining activities.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State of Andhra Pradesh submits, on instructions, that the State has no objection to mining activities being carried out within its demarcated area.

5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties, we are of the opinion that this issue would require consideration.

6. The matter be listed along with W.P.(C) No.411/2010 on 10.08.2022, before an appropriate Bench.

(SATISH KUMAR YADAV)  
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(R.S. NARAYANAN)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)