

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGSSPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No. 16393/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07-10-2025 in WPST No. 14829/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay]

MANISHA NIMESH MEHTA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT BOARD &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 110517/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 110516/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 13027/2026 (IX)

(IA No. 109301/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Date : 27-04-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Chand Qureshi, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

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

1. Delay condoned.
2. When these matters were called in the first instance, a pass over was sought but, thereafter, Mr. Mathews J. Nedumpara, learned counsel, who was engaged to argue these matters, reported to this Court that he had relinquished the briefs and would not be appearing.

3. Significantly, Mr. Chand Qureshi, learned Advocate-on-record for the petitioner, did not appear either when the pass over was sought or when Mr. Mathews J. Nedumpara reported to this Court that he would not be appearing. However, to enable the Advocate-on-record to do so, the matters were again passed over.
4. Mr. Chand Qureshi, learned Advocate-on-record, then appeared online during the afternoon session and requested for an adjournment on the ground that he is unwell today.
5. However, having examined the impugned orders dated 17.10.2025 and 28.01.2026, we are not inclined to entertain this request. The order dated 17.10.2025 specifically records, in paragraph 9 thereof, that the petitioner committed sheer abuse of process as the writ petition filed before the High Court did not even disclose the fact that the earlier writ petition on the very same cause of action had been dismissed by the High Court, by order dated 01.07.2024. The writ petition also failed to mention the fact that SLP(C) No. 21367/2024 was filed before this Court and was, thereafter, withdrawn, and the fact that a review petition was filed, which was still pending before the High Court.
6. The later order dated 28.01.2026 was passed by a different Division Bench of the High Court, but the cause of action was once again the very same. This Division Bench noted the earlier orders dated 01.07.2024 and 17.10.2025 passed by coordinate Benches and refused to accept the submission made

on behalf of the petitioner that it was open to her to re-agitate the very same issues that had already been decided by the earlier judgments. The Division Bench specifically noted that the petitioner was filing writ petition after writ petition, being of the opinion that till the Court agreed with the contentions raised on her behalf, she was entitled to do so.

7. Given the aforestated orders and the observations made therein, we are not inclined to entertain these special leave petitions. However, considering the ill-health of the learned Advocate-on-record for the petitioner, we are not imposing exemplary costs, though these petitions beseech penalty.
8. The special leave petitions are, accordingly, dismissed.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

**(BABITA PANDEY)**  
**AR-CUM-PS**

**(CHETNA BALOONI)**  
**COURT MASTER (NSH)**