

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NOS.4452-4453/2026

SADGURU RAGHUVVEER PEDNEKAR & ORS.

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

GOA COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

O R D E R

1. The instant appeals have been filed challenging the order dated 20.03.2026 passed by the National Green Tribunal, Western Zone, Bench Pune (in short, the 'NGT'). The NGT vide the impugned order directed partial modification of the demolition order and permitted the demolition of only one residential structure, namely structure 'C.' The structures originally authorised for demolition had been identified by the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority (hereinafter 'GCZMA') as structures A, B, C, D and E. The relevant and operative part of the NGT order reads as follows:

"19. On the other hand, this argument has been refuted by the learned counsel for respondent no.5 and GCZMA on the ground that this is a fabricated document because at the time when this

is said to have been issued, no computerized typing was in practice. Moreover, it bears the heading Permit No. 106/86-87 which is also very uncommon because whenever such kind of permission was granted for construction, heading "License" is used. It is also emphasized that the area of the construction of this house is calculated to be 66 square meters only and a total area on which this construction is done is found to be 112 square meters. It was a very small structure which cannot be equated with the structure which is identified by the GCZMA by letters "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E". Though, we tried to understand from both the parties as to what was the area of construction formed in the new construction that is Construction "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E", which included new and old both, none of the parties could respond to this, therefore, it is difficult for us to match the area, but the version of the appellant is definitely found to be false because the Site Inspection Report contains that Structure "C" was found to be under construction, while the learned counsel for the appellants argued that the house existed since prior to 1991 and it is the same which has been shown in the map at page no. 55. However, the Appellants have not made any averment to this effect and the documents have also failed to advert to this fact in the pleading that as on date the area of the entire house is same, which was shown at the map at page no. 55 of the paper book and no addition to the same was done.

20. After having heard to the respective parties' argument, we are of the view that certainly, the area, which is shown in the map at page no. 55 of paper book, does not match with the present area of the house which is shown with the letters "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E" altogether. Moreover, the version of appellant is also found to be false because during the Site Inspection, the construction regarding "C" was found to be going on. Therefore, that construction certainly did not exist at the earlier point of time.

21. We, after having heard the arguments in this regard are of the view that this is erroneous finding because once it is admitted by the GCZMA that Structure "E" fell outside the CRZ area, the same could not have been ordered to be demolished as they do not have any jurisdiction regarding the same. So, they should have confined their order only regarding demolition of Structure "C"

to the extent that the same fell in the CRZ area and on that count itself the impugned order is found to be defective and needs to be set aside. We, accordingly modify the impugned order directing the GCZMA to ensure that whatever structure is found to be there inside the CRZ area as shown in the Site Plan annexed at page no. 139 of the paper book, which shall form part of this judgment, the same would be demolished within 30 days from uploading of this order as the same is found to be illegal construction without any permission having been obtained from the GCZMA."

2. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the appellants submitted that the demolition of structure 'C' is likely to have an adverse impact on structure 'E,' which belongs to the appellants.

3. With a view to avoid any undue hardship to the appellants, and in light of the statement made on their behalf to the effect that the demolition of the illegal structure 'C' shall be carried out in consultation with all concerned parties and in such a manner so as to ensure that structure 'E' is not affected, the instant appeals stand disposed of. The appellants or their associates will comply with the aforesaid directions within two weeks and submit a compliance report to the GCZMA. The GCZMA is hereby directed to inspect the site and ensure that the directions issued by the NGT have been complied with.

4. It is, however, clarified that the above-stated order with respect to the protection of structure 'E' shall not be construed in such a manner that this Court has in any manner

legalised structure 'E'. If any proceeding is pending in respect thereof, the same shall proceed and be decided independently as per its own merits.

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

.....J.
(VIPUL M. PANCHOLI)

NEW DELHI;
APRIL 16, 2026

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

Civil Appeal No(s).4452-4453/2026

SADGURU RAGHUVVEER PEDNEKAR & ORS.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

GOA COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 114000/2026 - STAY APPLICATION

Date : 16-04-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPUL M. PANCHOLI

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Ninad Laud, Adv.
Mr. Amay Phadte, Adv.
Mr. Austin Dsouza, Adv.
Mr. Guruprasad Naik, Adv.
Mr. Dcosta Ivo Manuel Simon, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Pallav Shishodia, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ankur Kumar, Adv.
Dr. Lokendra Malik, Adv.
Ms. Ruchi Gupta, AOR

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

1. The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.
2. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(signed order is placed on the file)

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR