



\$~115

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

+ W.P.(C) 1664/2026, CM APPL. 8069/2026, CM APPL. 8070/2026 & CM APPL. 8071/2026

M/S VEDANTA LIMITED

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Nidhesh Gupta Senior Adv, Mr. Naveen Kumar Adv, Mr Ujjawal Kumar Rai Adv, Mr. Aditya Goyal Adv, Mr. Sudhanshu Pathak Adv, Mr. Vikram Dwivedi Adv. Ms. Isha Baloni Adv, Mr. Rishabh Chaudhary Adv, Mr. Lakshay Singh Adv, Ms.Pragya Prachi Pandey Adv.

versus

THE NOMINATED AUTHORITY MINISTRY OF COAL
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankur Mittal, CGSC, Mr. Aviraj Pandey, Adv., Ms. Rabaica Jaiswal, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **09.02.2026**

1. This order shall be read in continuation to the order dated 07.02.2026 passed by this Court. For the sake of clarity paragraph nos.16 & 17 are being reproduced as under: -

“16. Having noted the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the Court is of the prima facie opinion that the grievance if any, which the petitioner has against the Impugned Orders, must be agitated before the the jurisdictional High Court i.e., at Orissa.

17. However, under the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the Court defers the hearing of the present petition till 09.02.2026 to enable the parties to take instructions and to assist the Court. Mr. Mittal to also take instructions as to why the contesting respondents are not being



represented before the Special Tribunal.”

2. The petitioner has challenged the subsequent Show Cause Notice in case No. 31/2025, before the Special Tribunal. The stay application is pending. The Special Tribunal, for unavoidable reasons, is not able to decide the same. One of the reasons as attributed by the Special Tribunal, is the non-appearance of the contesting respondent.
3. Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned CGSC submits that he has already advised the contesting respondent to appear before the Special Tribunal. In view thereof, there does not seem to be any impediment for the Special Tribunal to consider and decide the interim application filed in case no.31/2025.
4. It, however, becomes necessary to protect the petitioner till the stay application is adjudicated by the Tribunal.
5. Let the status quo *qua* any precipitative action be maintained till then. Ordered accordingly.
6. The Court was of the view, that even this grievance could have been agitated by the petitioner before the jurisdictional High Court. However, it is pointed out that this Court, on earlier occasion, as noted in its order dated 07.02.2026, had granted some protection to the petitioner. Under these peculiar circumstances, this order is being passed.
7. Needless to state, if the petitioner will have any further grievance, it shall be agitated before the jurisdictional High Court, i.e. Orissa, where material, essential and integral cause of action has arisen.
8. Petition stands disposed of. All rights and contentions are left open.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 9, 2026/P