



\$~43

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 6097/2023, CM APPL. 23915/2023&CM APPL. 27278/2023
TASHILA LOGISTICS PRIVATE LIMITEDPetitioner

Through: Mr. Rishabh Jain, Advocate.
versus

UNION OF INDIA THROUGH MINISTRY OF COAL THROUGH
SECRETARY & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Atmaram N. S. Nadkarni Sr. Adv.
with Dr. Harsh Pathak, Mrs. Shaveta Mahajan, Mr. Mohit Choubey, Mr. Salvador Santosh Rebello, Ms. Deepti Arya and Mr. Aditya Nema, Advocates for Coal India Limited.
Ms. Radhika Bishwajit Dubey, CGSC with Ms. Gurleen Kaur, Mr. Vivek Sharma, Ms. Aparajit Verma, Advocates for DGR with Lt. Col. Abhishek Juyal, DGR, JD (SE).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER
07.08.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeks the following prayers:

“i. Issue a writ in the nature of Certiorari, or any other appropriate Writ/Order/Direction, thereby quashing the Impugned Letters dated 26.06.2020, 30.06.2020 (Annexure P-I (Colly)), 17.01.2023 and 08.02.2023 (Annexure P-26 & P-28 (respectively)) and any other unilateral action by Respondent No.3 and 4 or its subsidiary, towards attempting discontinuation of the Schemes;
ii. Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to consider



the grant/sanction of the extension of Sponsorship of Petitioner and renewal of Transport Agreement of Petitioner Company for a second term of four (4) years commencing from 30.05.2023 in accordance with Clause 8 of the governing MoD;

iii. Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to consider the grant/sanction of the requests of the Petitioner for fleet extension from existing running companies under the existing terms and condition for another term of four (4) years in terms of the governing MOU as well as the Agreement dated 07.07.2016, commenced from 17.06.2016;

iv. Issue a Writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents to make a minimum allocation of 32% of coal transportation work of Respondent No.3 in all its subsidiaries, including Respondent No.4, on the basis of past practice, to ESM Cos. and Eligible Persons under the Scheme, including the Petitioner herein:

v. Grant any such further reliefs and/or pass any such further orders in favour of the Petitioner and against the Respondents as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the present facts and circumstances;”

3. Learned counsel for Directorate General of Resettlement (‘DGR’), on instructions of Lt. Col. Abhishek Juyal submits that there is no objection with respect to grant of extension of tenure of the petitioner/company in terms of Memorandum of Understanding dated 12.12.2013. It is further submitted that on a representation made by the petitioner-company for enhancement of fleet as per clause 7 of MoU dated 12.12.2013, the same shall be decided by the competent authority in accordance with the rules.

4. In view of the above, learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to press the present petition.

5. Accordingly, the present petition is not pressed and disposed of accordingly.

6. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

7. On the representation being made by the petitioner-company, the same



shall be disposed of by the competent authority within a period of 3 months from today.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 7, 2025/bsr/dj