



Suzana

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO.28 OF 2026

SANDEEP SHAMBHU AROLKAR

... PETITIONER

Versus

**THE GOA COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT
AUTHORITY AND 3 ORS.**

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Balkrishna Sardesai with Ms. Prajali Tari, Advocates for the
Petitioner.

Mr. Eeshan Usapkar, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

Mr. Suhas Parab, Additional Government Advocate for Respondent Nos.
3 to 5.

**CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES &
AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, JJ.**

DATED :- 19th January, 2026

P.C.

1. Registry to waive objections and register the matter.
2. This Petition has taken exception to an Order dated 17.04.2025, passed by the Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority, holding the structure constructed by the Petitioner in Survey No.269/2 of Village Mandrem to be illegal. This Order was challenged by the Petitioner before the National Green Tribunal (NGT) in Appeal No.351/2025, in

which the interim relief seeking a stay of the impugned Order was also sought. The Petitioner submits that since the NGT was not conducting any sittings at the relevant time, the Petitioner was forced to approach this Court in its writ jurisdiction, considering that the Petitioner was left without any remedy.

3. In the meantime, the NGT has heard the Appeal and has listed the same on 08.06.2026 for final hearing. However, the interim relief which was sought therein was not considered since the present Petition was pending in this Court.

4. Considering that the NGT is not functioning and the cause for approaching this Court survives, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, on instructions, and considering that an alternate remedy is available, seeks to withdraw this Petition, with liberty to press for the interim relief sought before the NGT on an urgent basis.

5. On this submission, since an alternate remedy is available to the Petitioner, the Petition stands dismissed as withdrawn.

The Petitioner is at liberty to press for the interim relief sought in Appeal No.151/2025 before the NGT, which shall consider the application for interim relief on its own merits.

6. It is made clear that until the NGT disposes of the Appeal that is pending before it, the Petitioner undertakes to this Court that no

commercial activity would be conducted in the structure which is subject matter of the demolition Order.

AMIT S. JAMSANDEKAR, J. VALMIKI MENEZES, J.