

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I.A. No.376 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13381 OF 1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For directions) WITH

I.A. Nos.395 and 397 & 454 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL)
NO. 13381/1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For impleadment and permission to file addl. documents on
behalf of NPCC and permission to file rejoinder affidavit)

S.L.P.(C)...CC NO.12071 of 2005

M/S. MOHAN BRICKFIELD
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

U.P. POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln. for c/delay in filing SLP and office report)

I.A. No.387 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13381 OF 1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For directions)

I.A. No.389 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13381 OF 1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For directions)

I.A. No.444 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13381 OF 1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(For directions)

IN THE MATTER OF : ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

...2/-

I.A. No.453 in WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 13381 OF 1984

M.C. MEHTA
VERSUS
Petitioner(s)

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondent(s)

Mr. B.V. Balramdas,Adv.

For U.P. Pollution
Control Board

Mr. Pradeep Mishra,Adv.
Mr. T. Mahipal,Adv.
Mr. Suraj Singh,Adv.

Mr. Mohd. Taiyab Khan,Adv.
Mr. Shakil Ahmad Syed,Adv.

For Central Vigilance

Commission Mr. M.N. Rao, Sr.Adv. (N.P.)
Mr. Sanjay R. Hegde,Adv.
Mr. Anil Kr. Mishra,Adv.

For Agra Dev.
Authority

Mr. Ashok K. Srivastava,Adv.
Mr. Saurabh Trivedi,Adv.

For State of Haryana

Mr. Ajay Siwach,AAG
Mr. T.V. George,Adv.

For State of U.P.

Mr. Hrish Salve, Sr.Adv.
Mr. Shail Kumar Dwivedi, A.A.G.
Mr. Vijay Pratap Singh,Adv.
Mr. Anil Kumar Jha,Adv.
Mr. S. Wasim A. Qadri,Adv.

For CPCB

Mr. Vijay Panjwani,Adv.

Mr. Rakesh K. Khanna,Adv.
Dr. Rashmi Khanna,Adv.
Miss Jahanvi Warah,Adv.
Mr. Reetesh Singh,Adv.

....5/-

-5-

Mrs. Anil Katiyar,Adv.

Mr. Atishi Dipankar,Adv.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Aggarwal,Adv.

Ms. Binu Tamta,Adv.

Mr. Rajiv Tyagi,Adv.
Mr. Ranjan Mozumdar,Adv.
Mr. Navneet,Adv.

Mr. Ajay K. Agrawal(in-person)
Mr. T.S. Doabia,Sr.Adv.

Mr. V.K. Verma,Adv.

Mr. Pranab Kumar Mullick,Adv.

Mr. K.K. Mohan,Adv.

Mr. Vishwajit Singh,Adv.

Ms. Mridula Ray Bhardwaj,Adv.
Ms. S. Dutta,Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
ORDER

I.A.No.444:

It is accepted by the learned Solicitor General appearing on behalf of the Archaeological Survey of India that in stead and place of carrying out a study in regard to the carrying capacity, not only the mausoleum itself but the entire Taj Complex should be taken into consideration. Let the matter appear two weeks hence so as to enable the learned Solicitor General to place before us the names of suitable persons for constitution of a Committee, for entrusting the aforementioned job.

....6/-

-6-

I.A.No.464:

An affidavit has been affirmed on behalf of the Archaeological Survey of India stating:

"3. I submit that the Archaeological Survey of India has not granted any permission to the Microsoft to hold any function for release of their Window Vista and 2007 Office System or for that matter any other programme.

On enquiries made by me I have ascertained that no such programme or function was held within the Taj premises.

4. I submit that however, a permission was granted to Shri Pankaj, Shri Akash, Shri Dinesh & Shri Anup C/o Dainik Jagran, Agra for shooting with cast at Mehtab Bagh Complex across the river Yamuna.

5. I submit that the aforesaid shooting was held without any light, sound and audience and such permission for shooting were given by the Department on the earlier occasion also.

6. I submit that the only permission which was granted was for carrying out a photo-shoot and not for holding any function as such there has been no violation of any order of this Hon'ble Court.

7. I state that the newspaper reports have wrongly been reported that the dancers had performed in front of Taj Mahal."

Before us, also a copy of permission accorded to Shri Pankaj and others has been placed.

In view of the statements made in the said affidavit, we are of the opinion that no further orders need be passed on I.A.No.464 which is accordingly dismissed.

...7/-

-7-

I.A.Nos.462:

Let a reply be filed during the course of the day. Put up after two weeks.

I.A.No.465:

List after two weeks.

BHARDWAJ)
COURT MASTER

COURT MASTER