



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **LPA 759/2025 & CM APPL. 78083-84/2025**

VEDANTA LIMITED

.....Appellant

Through: Mr.Nidhesh Gupta, Sr.Adv. with
Mr.Naveen Kumar, Mr.Ujjawal Kumar
Rai, Mr.Sudhanshu Pathak, Mr.Jimut
Buran Mohapatra, Mr.Prabhat Kumar
Rai, Mr.Aditya Goyal, Ms.Isha Baloni,
Mr.Rishabh Chaudhary, Mr.Lakshay
Singh and Ms.Pragya Prachi Pandey,
Advs.

versus

**THE NOMINATED AUTHORITY MINISTRY OF COAL
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AND ORS & ORS.**Respondents

Through: Mr. Chetan Sharma, ASG with
Mr.Ankur Mittal, CGSC along with
Mr.Aviraj Pandey, Mr.Amit Gupta,
Mr.R.V. Prabhat, Mr.Shubham Sharma,
Mr.Vikram Singh, Mr.Yashwardhan
Sharma and Mr.Naman, Advs.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA**

ORDER

%

10.12.2025

CM APPL. 78085/2025 (for exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

LPA 759/2025 & CM APPL. 78083-84/2025

3. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
4. Learned counsel for the appellants restricts his prayer for issuing a



direction to the Tribunal created under Section 27 of the Coal Mines (Special Provisions) Act, 2015 for disposal of the dispute which may be raised by the respondent with expedition.

5. If we peruse Section 27 (3) of the said Act, we find that the said provision itself mandates the Tribunal to make an Award in writing within a period of 90 days from the institution of reference of the dispute.

6. Accordingly, we do not see any reason why the Tribunal may not abide by the said mandate as contained in Section 27 (3) of the said Act.

7. Learned counsel for the appellant has also drawn our attention to certain observations made by learned Single Judge in the impugned order, wherein it has been provided that appeal shall be preferred within 10 days and till that time the interim order passed by the learned Single Judge directing maintenance of the *status quo* with respect to the Performance Bank Guarantee, shall continue to operate. The learned Single Judge has also clarified that extension of interim order is for a period of 10 days or till the time the party concerned approaches the Tribunal.

8. It is the submission of the learned counsel for the appellant that the interim protection granted by learned Single Judge may be extended till the disposal of the stay application, which may be filed while raising the dispute under Section 27 (3) of the said Act.

9. Accordingly, we provide that if any application for stay is preferred while raising the dispute under Section 27 (3) of the Act, the authority concerned shall decide the same as well, with expedition and till disposal of such stay application, the impugned protection granted by learned Single Judge shall continue to operate.

10. We make it clear that in case the dispute is not raised under Section 27 (3) of the said Act within time as stipulated by learned Single Judge in the impugned order, benefit of this order shall not be available to the appellant.



11. The appeal along with application(s) stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 10, 2025

“shailndra”