

\212)

ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.7

SECTION PIL

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

IA Nos. 21, 24, 26, 30, 33, 37-39, 40, 45, 47, 50-52, 61, 62, 67, 68
and 69 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 653 of 1994

WASIM AHMED SAEED

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS

Respondent(s)

(With appln. for directions, intervention, take on record Joint Report in compliance of order dated 05.08.2004, modification of Court's order dated 05.08.2004 and 02.09.2004, permission and directions and impleadment and office report)

WITH
IA Nos. 14, 15 and 17 in Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 162/2000 in
Writ Petition (Civil) No. 653 of 1994

(With appln(s) for exemption from filing O.T. and recalling of order dated 12.05.2000 and restoration of order dated 16.3.1998 & 20.7.98 and further directions with office report)

IA Nos. 14-17 in IA No.13 in WP (C) No. 239 of 1997
(With appln(s) for impleadment and directions and office report)

Date: 20/01/2014 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.S. RADHAKRISHNAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAMAJIT SEN

Counsel for the parties

Amicus Curiae Mr. Altaf Ahmad, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Imtiaz Ahmed, Adv.

Mr. Manjit Singh, AAG
Mr. Tarjit Singh, Adv.
Mr. Vinay Kuhar, Adv.
Ms. Nupur Choudhary, Adv.

Mr. Irshad Ahmed, AAG, State of U.P.
Mr. Samir Ali Khan, Adv.

Mr. Yunus Malik, Adv.
Mr. Shashank Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aman Malik, Adv.

Mr. A.D.N. Rao, Adv.
Mr. Sudipto Sircar, Adv.
Mr. A. Venkatesh, Adv.
Ms. Vaishali R., Adv.

Mr. Ashok Kr. Singh, Adv.
Mr. Naresh K. Gaur, Adv.
Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Adv.

Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Chetan Chawla, Adv.
Ms. Nandini Gupta, Adv.
Mr. D.S. Mahra, Adv.
Mr. Mohan Prasad Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Yasir Rauf, Adv.
Mr. S.N. Terdal, Adv.

Mr. B. Krishna Prasad, Adv.

Mrs. Anil Katiyar, Adv.

Mr. P. Parmeswaran, Adv.

Ms. Sushma Suri, Adv.

Mr. Sudhir Kulshrestha, Adv.

Mr. Shakil Ahmed, Adv.

Mr. V.K. Verma, Adv.

Mr. Arvind Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Prashant Chaudhary, Adv.

Mr. B.V. Balramdas, Adv.

Dr. Monika Gusain, Adv.

M/s. Equity Lex Associates, Adv.

Mr. Aftab Ali Khan, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

Heard counsel on either side.

We have also perused the affidavit filed on behalf of the State of Uttar Pradesh. Affidavit states that the State is ready to provide security to the construction of the left over wall as and when A.S.I. makes a request. State will also fully cooperate with the A.S.I. If police protection is required, the State will provide that too.

In view of the stand taken by the State of Uttar Pradesh, no further orders are necessary. It is for the A.S.I. to make a request to the State Government, in the event of which the State will provide adequate facilities to carry out the construction work of the wall and provide police protection, if necessary.

Learned Amicus Curiae also referred to paragraph 3 of the affidavit of the State of Uttar Pradesh, wherein the State has expressed the difficulty in widening the road due to lack of space. Over and above, it is also pointed that for the said purpose they have to acquire land. Needless to say, the widening of the road is necessary since lot of vehicles have to pass through this road, especially when the width of the road is only 5.5 mtrs.

In such circumstances, the State will examine the question of widening of the road without delay and also for providing parking space.

Learned counsel for the A.S.I. submitted that the entry on the rear side to the house of Mr. Veer Singh, which is near to the staircase, has to be closed for the protection of the monument.

These are the aspects to be examined by the State of Uttar Pradesh and should come out with their response within one month.

The A.S.I. will expedite the installation of CCTV cameras in and around the important areas of the monument complex.

State Government is also directed to file their response to

I.A. No.68-69 in W.P. No.653/1994.
Post after a month.

| (NARENDRA PRASAD)
| COURT MASTER

| | (RENUKA SADANA)
| | COURT MASTER

|

|