

ITEM NO.25

COURT NO.7

SECTION XII-A

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.5434/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 27-01-2026 in IA No. 1/2026 passed by the High Court for the State of Telangana at Hyderabad]

PATANJALI FOODS LIMITED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

DEPARTMENT OF HORTICULTURE & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date : 05-05-2026 This petition 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. Neeraj Kishan Kaul, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Navin Pahwa, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Divyanshu Srivastava, Adv.
Mr. Prahastha Madapathi, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka Deshmukh, Adv.
Mr. Saikat Mukherjee, Adv.
Mr. Alok Nayak, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Nagpal, Adv.
Ms. Anukanksha Singh, Adv.
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Dr. S. Muralidhar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prasanna S., AOR
Ms. Ninni Susan Thomas,, Adv.
Ms. Megha Gupta,, Adv.
Ms. Injila Muslim Zaidi, Adv.
Mr. Maamidi Ashish Reddy, Adv.
Mr. Prasanna B, Adv.

Mr. Sravan Kumar Karanam, AOR
Mr. Kumar Abhishek, Adv.
Mr. P. Venkatraju, Adv.
Ms. M. Harshini, Adv.
Ms. G. Sushmita, Adv.

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

1. This petition arises from an interim order passed by the High Court dated 27-01-2026 in IA No. 1 of 2026 preferred in Writ Appeal No. 102 of 2026, by which the interim application preferred by the petitioner before us came to be rejected.
2. It appears from the materials on record that the petitioner before us preferred a Writ Petition No. 9604 of 2025 seeking to challenge two Government Orders bearing Nos.13 and 14 respectively, dated 15th March 2025, issued by the State of Telangana and the consequential letters.
3. The Writ Petition was adjudicated by the learned Single Judge and by Judgment and Order dated 08-01-2026, the same came to be rejected.
4. It also appears that pending the adjudication of the Writ Petition before the Single Judge, there was an interim order operating in favor of the petitioner suspending the operation of the two Government Orders which were made subject-matter of challenge.
5. Being dissatisfied with the Judgment and Order passed by the learned Single Judge, the petitioner is now before the Division Bench of the High Court by way of Writ Appeal No. 102 of 2026.
6. In the said Writ Appeal, an IA was preferred seeking the very same relief i.e. stay of the operation of the two Government Orders cancelling the allotment and re-allotting it to Respondent No.4. The IA came to be rejected and thereby the relief prayed for was declined.
7. In such circumstances, the petitioner is here before us with the present petition.
8. We heard Mr. Neeraj Kishan Kaul and Mr. Navin Pahwa, learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner and Dr. S. Muralidhar, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the State of Telangana. We

also heard Mr. Ravi Shankar Jandhyala, the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.4.

9. This matter came up for hearing for the first time on 9th February, 2026. On that date, we issued notice and also directed the parties to maintain *status quo*.

10. We are of the view that since the Order of *status quo* has continued for a period of almost three months, it will be in the fitness of things if we request the High Court to take up Writ Appeal No. 102 of 2026 for hearing and see to it that the same is disposed of within a period of three months from today.

11. We request both the sides to cooperate for the expeditious hearing and disposal of the Writ Appeal before the Division Bench.

12. Till the Writ Appeal is disposed of, the Order of *status quo* passed by us shall remain in operation.

13. With the aforesaid, this petition stands disposed of.

14. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(VISHAL ANAND)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(POOJA SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)