



Suchitra

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO.58/2026
IN
PIL WRIT PETITION NO.688/2025 (F)**

PRAVINSINGH ARJUN SHEDGAONKAR
AND ANR.

... APPLICANTS

Versus

THE STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 8 ORS.

... RESPONDENTS

Ms Norma Alvares, Senior Advocate with Ms Malisa Simoes and Mr Om D'Costa, Advocates for the Applicants.

Mr Mustafa Doctor (thr VC), Senior Advocate with Mr Prashil Arolkar, Addl. Govt. Advocate, Ms Rohini Jaiswal (VC), Mr Manas Kotak, Ms Avantika Mehndiratta, Shevarz Khan and Jamisha Kashyap (thr VC), Advocates for Respondent Nos.1, 2 and 8.

Mr Nikhil Rohatgi, Mr Mukul Rohatgi (thr VC), Mr Jatin Ramaiya and Mr Omkar Parab, Advocates for Respondent No.3.

Mr Shivan Desai and Ms Riya Amonkar, Advocates for Respondent No.4.

Mr Kapil Sibal, Senior Advocate, Mr S. S. Kantak, Senior Advocate with Ms Neha Kholkar, Ms Saicha Dessai and Mr Venkatesh Ameya Nayak Salatry, Mr Vikram Trivedi, Mr Sunil Trilokchandani, Mr Himalaya Trilokchandani and Mr Anshu Singh, Advocates for Respondent No.5.

Mr S. Priolkar, Addl. Govt. Advocate for Respondent No.7-GSEIAA.

Mr Arjun Naik, Advocate for Respondent No.10 (thr VC).

**CORAM: VALMIKI MENEZES &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATED: 23rd JULY 2026

P.C. :

1. Affidavits in reply filed by Respondent Nos.2 and 4 are taken on record.
2. The interim relief sought in this civil application is for staying the operation of the Technical Clearance orders referred to in prayer clause 22(b) and the Construction Licenses issued by the Village Panchayat of Carapur-Sarvona which are based upon such technical clearances. The interim relief is being sought on the premise, as stated in paragraph 14 to the application, that the orders granting technical clearance and construction licenses are in violation to the Supreme Court's order dated 21st/22nd July, 2025 directing status quo to be maintained by the Town and Country Planning Department.
3. After considering the rival submissions, we are of the opinion that to decide the grant of interim relief we would be called upon to interpret the effect of the status quo order granted by the Supreme Court. This would be an inappropriate process, and it would be for the Applicants to approach the Supreme Court for any clarification in that regard. We also note, on going through the order of the Supreme Court, that in addition to directing status quo to be maintained, the Supreme Court has also granted a stay with respect to the Petitions giving rise to the Special Leave Petitions (Civil) No.15973 to 15975 of 2025 pending before it. According to the Applicants, the present Petition, i.e. PIL Writ Petition No.688/2025 (F) was not one such petition referred to in the order of the Supreme Court. In our

opinion, even this contention would be a question to be interpreted by the Supreme Court and not by this Court. Considering these submissions, for the moment, we refrain from granting any interim relief as prayed for, and we leave it open to the Applicants to press for such interim relief after the outcome of the pending SLPs before the Supreme Court is known.

4. List this Civil Application in the PIL Writ Petition No.688/2025 (F) on 30.09.2026.

HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.