

Mohite

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 2893 OF 2023

Digitally
signed by
TRUSHA
TUSHAR
MOHITE
Date:
2024.01.12
14:59:49
+0530

V.V.Minerals and Anr.

... Petitioners

Versus

Director (Revisional Authority under MMDR Act, 1957)

... Respondents

Mr.Rajeev K. Panday a/w Mr.Madhur Rai i/b Mr.Ashish Kanojia for the
Petitioners

Mr.C.N.Chavan for the Respondents

**CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, JJ.**
DATED: 11 January, 2024

P.C.

1. This Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed praying for the limited relief.

“A. This Hon’ble Court be pleased to pass an order by way of a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ directing the revisional authority viz. Respondent no.1 herein to pass order in the revision petition in accordance with law and pronounce the judgment/final order reserved on 3-7-2023 in Revision Petition No.27(12)/2016(RC-II (Exhibit “B”))”

2. The Petitioner has filed a Revision under Section 30 of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957, read with Rule 35 of the Minerals (other than Atomic & Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Consession Rules, 2016, being aggrieved by an Order dated 9th November 2016, passed by the District Collector of Tirunelveli District, District Collectorate, Tirunelveli, who is Respondent No.2 in the said proceedings. The Revision proceedings were initially filed before the regular Revisional authority in Tamil Nadu. However, by an Order dated 14th October 2021 passed by the Joint Secretary & Revisionary Authority (Dr. Veena Kumari Dermal), the Revision proceedings

came to be transferred to be adjudicated at Mumbai by the Director, Revisional Authority, Government of India, Department of Atomic Energy, Anushakti Bhavan, Mumbai, who is Respondent No.1. The said transfer was undertaken in view of the directives of the Central Government in the Department of Industries in the Ministry of Mines, Government of India. The contention of the Petitioner is that the Revision Application, which is of the year 2016, has been heard finally and the Orders to be passed by Respondent No.1 are awaited. It is in these circumstances that the Petition is filed stating that the only relief is that Respondent No.1 be directed to pass an Order on the Revision Application filed on behalf of the Petitioner, on which orders were reserved on 3rd July 2023.

3. Mr.Chavan, the learned counsel representing the Respondents, submits that there are some proceedings which are pending before the Madras High Court in regard to the issues raised in the Petition. However, it appears that, even if there are some other issues pending, the Revision Application filed by the Petitioner is of the year 2016 and it would be required to be decided in accordance with law especially since the hearing of the same has already been concluded and which is reserved for Orders on 3rd July 2023.

4. In the aforesaid circumstances, considering the limited relief as prayed for, we direct the Revisional Authority, Respondent No.1, to pass appropriate Orders on the Revision Application as expeditiously as possible, and within a period of six weeks from today.

5. All contentions of the parties are expressly kept open.

6. Disposed of in above terms.

(FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)