

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CALANGUTE CONSTITUENCY
FORUM THR. ITS MEMBER
AGNELO BARRETO ... Petitioner.

THE STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS
CHIEF SECRETARY AND 13 ORS. Respondents.

Mr Siddharth Sawant, Addl. Govt. Advocate for respondent nos.1 , 2, 4,
6 to 11 and 14.

Mr R. Chodankar, Advocate for respondent no.3.

Mr S. Desai and Ms R. Amonkar, Advocate for respondent no. 5.

Date: 23rd July 2025.

1. PILWP was filed making a grievance about an illegal construction coming up in an area marked as CRZ 1 A with a specific pleading that it is eco sensitive area where construction of land

development can be permitted without permissions from Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority(GCZMA) as well as village Panchayat Candolim. Apart from this it was also demonstrated that survey no. 96/o situated near Archaeological Heritage Site Fort Aguada and the area was classified under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains Act, 1958 as the Fort itself was marked as “Protected Area”.

2. It in the wake of aforesaid grievance being made, on 23.6.2025 we recorded the statement made by the Deputy Solicitor General on behalf of respondent no. 3 that no construction was going on at the site.

3. Today, Mr Chodankar, representing respondent no.3/the Archaeological Survey of India has instructions to make a statement that the proposed project itself has been withdrawn and he would place on record the communication from the General Manager, the Indian Oil Foundation to the Addl. Director General, Archaeological Survey of India dated 3.7.2025, stating that since the permission was sought from ASI to resume the work or formally closing the existing contract, no response is received. Considering that the contractual terms and repeated communications from the contractor regarding idling of resources, incurring losses etc, it has become difficult on the Indian Oil Foundation to extend the contractual timeliness.

4. In the wake of the aforesaid request is made for allowing the contractor to clear the site and take over completed facilities.
5. The said communication is taken on record and marked X for identification.
6. In addition to recording the statement made by Mr Chodankar that the proposed project being closed, we deem it appropriate to dispose of PILWP.
7. Needless to state that the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court if said statement is not honoured.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.