

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Writ Petition(s)(Civil) No(s). 202/1995

IN RE : T.N. GODAVARMAN THIRUMULPAD

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION FOR 30.05.2025 (THROUGH SUPPLEMENTARY LIST) "ONLY" [1] IN RE : CORBETT I.A. NO. 20650 OF 2023 (CEC REPORT NO. 3/2023 - REPORT OF CEC IN APPLN. NO. 1558/2021 FILED BEFORE IT BY GAURAV KUMAR BANSAL) WITH I.A. NO. 75033 OF 2023 (Application For Exemption From Filing O.T.) AND I.A. NO. 199355 OF 2024 (CEC REPORT NO. 16/2024 - INTERIM REPORT OF THE CEC ON APPLN. NO. 1578/2024 FILED BY SHRI ABHIJAY NEGI IN I.A. NO. 20650/2023) IN RE : GAURAV KUMAR BANSAL (FOR COMPLIANCE OF ORDER DATED 06.03.2024) AND [2] I.A. NOS. 117782, 117783 AND 117785 of 2025 [Applications for Impleadment, Directions and O.T.] IN RE : SANJAY KUMAR IN WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) NO. 202/1995 "ONLY" ARE LISTED IN W.P.(C) No. 202/1995 "ONLY" ON 30.05.2025 (THROUGH SUPPLEMENTARY LIST) AND THE NAMES OF "ONLY" THE FOLLOWING ADVOCATES MAY BE TREATED TO HAVE BEEN SHOWN AGAINST THESE I.As. MR. HARISH N. SALVE, SR. ADV. [A.C.], MR. A.D.N. RAO, SR. ADVOCATE [A.C.], MS. APARAJITA SINGH, SR. ADVOCATE [A.C.], MR. SIDDHARTHA CHOWDHURY, ADVOCATE [A.C.] MR. K. PARAMESHWAR, SR. ADVOCATE [A.C.] MR. G.S. MAKKER, ADVOCATE MR. S.N. TERDAL, ADVOCATE FOR S. NO. [1] MR. K. PARAMESHWAR (A.C.), DR. ABHISHEK ATREY (FOR STATE OF UTTARAKHAND), MR. G.S. MAKKER, MR. M.K. MARORIA (FOR C.B.I.) FOR S.NO. [2] MR. K. PARAMESHWAR (A.C.), MS. RANI MISHRA

Date : 30-05-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.S. CHANDURKAR

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. K. Parameshwar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. M.V. Mukunda, Adv.
Ms. Kanti, Adv.
Mr. Srinivas Patil, Adv.
Ms. Chitransha Singh Shikarwar, Adv.

Mr. Chanchal Kumar Ganguli, AOR
M/S. Plr Chambers And Co., AOR

Mr. Syed Mehdi Imam, AOR
Mr. T. Harish Kumar, AOR
M/S. Mitter & Mitter Co., AOR
M/S. Lawyer S Knit & Co, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Mr. Gaichangpou Gangmei, AOR

Mr. Raj Kishor Choudhary, AOR
Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, Adv.
Mr. Syed Faizan Ali, Adv.
Mr. Himanshu Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Shuvodeep Roy, AOR
Mr. Deepayan Dutta, Adv.
Mr. Saurabh Tripathi, Adv.

Mr. Ashok Mathur, AOR
M/S. Parekh & Co., AOR
M/S. K J John And Co, AOR
Mr. V. Balachandran, AOR
Mr. S. C. Birla, AOR
Mr. Ram Swarup Sharma, AOR
Mr. T. Mahipal, AOR
Mr. Umesh Bhagwat, AOR
Mrs. M. Qamaruddin, AOR
Mr. H. S. Parihar, AOR
Ms. Baby Krishnan, AOR
Mr. P. R. Ramasesh, AOR
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR
Mr. P. N. Gupta, AOR
Mr. Sarad Kumar Singhania, AOR
Mr. E. C. Agrawala, AOR
Mr. Kuldip Singh, AOR
Ms. Bina Madhavan, AOR
Ms. Pratibha Jain, AOR
Mr. Rajat Joseph, AOR
Mr. Gopal Prasad, AOR
Ms. Jyoti Mendiratta, AOR
Mr. S.. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee, AOR
Ms. Sharmila Upadhyay, AOR
Mr. Tejaswi Kumar Pradhan, AOR
M/S. Arputham Aruna And Co, AOR
Mrs. Nandini Gore, AOR
Mr. Raj Kumar Mehta, AOR
Ms. Madhu Moolchandani, AOR
Mrs. B. Sunita Rao, AOR
Mr. Rajeev Singh, AOR
Mrs. Kanchan Kaur Dhodi, AOR
Mr. Surya Kant, AOR
Mr. E. C. Vidya Sagar, AOR

M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, AOR
Mrs. Manik Karanjawala, AOR
Mr. Kamal Mohan Gupta, AOR
Mr. Prashant Kumar, AOR
Mr. Dharmendra Kumar Sinha, AOR
Mr. P. Parmeswaran, AOR
Ms. Sujata Kurdukar, AOR
Ms. Charu Mathur, AOR
Mr. A. Venayagam Balan, AOR
Mr. Sudarsh Menon, AOR
Mr. Ramesh Babu M. R., AOR
Mr. Vikrant Singh Bais, AOR
Mr. Shiva Pujan Singh, AOR
Ms. K. V. Bharathi Upadhyaya, AOR
Mr. Rajiv Mehta, AOR
Mr. Ejaz Maqbool, AOR
Mr. Rajesh, AOR
M/S. Corporate Law Group, AOR
Mr. Lakshmi Raman Singh, AOR
Mr. B V Deepak, AOR
Mr. T. N. Singh, AOR

Mr. C. L. Sahu, AOR
Mr. Rajendra Sahu, Adv.
Mr. Rishabh Sahu, Adv.
Ms. Hema Sahu, Adv.

Ms. Sumita Hazarika, AOR
Ms. Abha R. Sharma, AOR
Mr. Abhishek Chaudhary, AOR
Mrs. Rekha Pandey, AOR
Mr. Gopal Singh, AOR
Mr. T. V. George, AOR
Mr. Krishnanand Pandeya, AOR
Mr. Neeraj Shekhar, AOR
Ms. Asha Gopalan Nair, AOR

Mr. Rajesh Singh, AOR
Mr. Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Amit Kumar Chawla, Adv.
Mr. Akhileshwar Jha, Adv.
Mr. Varun Varma, Adv.
Mr. Chaman Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Shiva Nand Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Narendra Pal Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Charanjeet Sidhu, Adv.
Ms. Manisha Chawla, Adv.
Ms. Niharika Dwivedi, Adv.
Ms. Yamini Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Swati Vishan, Adv.
Mr. Javed Raza, Adv.
Mr. Ishank Ranjan, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Rajhans, Adv.

Mr. Prakhar Shukla, Adv.
Ms. Kanchan Kumari, Adv.

Ms. Hemantika Wahi, AOR
Mr. Mohd. Irshad Hanif, AOR
Mr. Punit Dutt Tyagi, AOR
Mr. Rathin Das, AOR
Mr. Ratan Kumar Choudhuri, AOR
Mr. Sudhir Kulshreshtha, AOR
Mr. Himanshu Shekhar, AOR
Ms. Sushma Suri, AOR
Mr. Sudhir Kumar Gupta, AOR
Mr. A. N. Arora, AOR
Mr. Irshad Ahmad, AOR
Mr. G. Prakash, AOR
Mr. E. M. S. Anam, AOR
Mrs. Bina Gupta, AOR
Mr. P. V. Yogeswaran, AOR
Mr. Jitendra Mohan Sharma, AOR
Ms. Malini Poduval, AOR
Ms. C. K. Sucharita, AOR
Ms. Binu Tamta, AOR
Mr. Shibashish Misra, AOR
Mr. K. L. Janjani, AOR
Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, AOR
Ms. A. Sumathi, AOR
Mr. Jai Prakash Pandey, AOR
Mrs. Anjani Aiyagari, AOR
Mr. K. V. Vijayakumar, AOR
Mrs. Rani Chhabra, AOR
Ms. Divya Roy, AOR
Mr. Tarun Johri, AOR
Mr. Radha Shyam Jena, AOR
Mr. Ajit Pudussery, AOR
Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, AOR
Mr. Vikash Singh, AOR
M/S. Cyril Amarchand Mangaldas Aor, AOR

Mr. Sandeep Kumar Jha, AOR
Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, A.A.G.
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, Adv.

Mr. Milind Kumar, AOR
Mr. Mohit Paul, AOR
Ms. Rashmi Nandakumar, AOR
Ms. Manika Tripathy, AOR
Ms. Ankita Sharma, AOR
Ms. Supreeta Sharanagouda, AOR
Ms. Ranu Purohit , AOR
Ms. Adarsh Nain, AOR
Mr. Guntur Pramod Kumar, AOR
Mr. Amrish Kumar, AOR
Ms. Purnima Krishna, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Mrs. Ruchi Kohli, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR
Mr. Raghav Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Jagdish Chandra Solanki, Adv.
Mr. Suhasini Sen, Adv.
Mr. Gaurang Bhushan, Adv.

Dr. Surender Singh Hooda, AOR
Mr. Sunil Kumar Verma, AOR
Mr. Prakash Kumar Singh, AOR
Ms. Tanya Srivastava, AOR
Ms. Seita Vaidyalingam, AOR
Mr. Anando Mukherjee, AOR
Ms. Anzu. K. Varkey, AOR
Ms. Astha Sharma, AOR
Mr. T. R. B. Sivakumar, AOR
Mr. Sujit Kumar Mishra , AOR
Mr. Aldanish Rein, AOR

Mr. Kunal Mimani, AOR
Ms. Shraddha Chirania, Adv.

Mr. Shantanu Kumar, AOR
Mr. Nishanth Patil, AOR
M/S. Venkat Palwai Law Associates, AOR
Mr. Ajay Marwah, AOR
Mr. Ravindra S. Garia, AOR

Mr. Karan Sharma, AOR

Ms. Sugandha Anand , AOR

Mr. Avijit Mani Tripathi, AOR
Mr. T.k. Nayak, Adv.

Mr. Deeptakirti Verma, AOR
Ms. Usha Nandini V., AOR
Ms. Vanshaja Shukla, AOR
Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR
Ms. Mayuri Raghuvanshi, AOR
Mr. Vivek Jain, AOR

Ms. Garima Prasad, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sudeep Kumar, AOR
Ms. Rupali, Adv.

Ms. Rani Mishra, AOR

Mr. Pukhrambam Ramesh Kumar, AOR
Mr. Karun Sharma, Adv.

Ms. Anupama Ngangom, Adv.
Ms. Rajkumari Divyasana, Adv.

Mr. Venkata Raghuvamsy D. , AOR
Ms. Swathi H. Prasad, AOR
Mr. Kamlendra Mishra, AOR
Mr. Somesh Chandra Jha, AOR
Ms. Ruchira Goel, AOR

Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.
Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR
Mr. Bharat Bagla, Adv.
Mr. Sourav Singh, Adv.
Mr. Aditya Krishna, Adv.
Mr. Adarsh Dubey, Adv.

Mr. Parth Awasthi, Adv.
Mr. Pashupathi Nath Razdan, AOR
Ms. Richa Tiwari, Adv.

Mr. Tarun Gupta, AOR

Mr. Sameer Abhyankar, AOR
Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Aakash Thakur, Adv.

Ms. Ranjeeta Rohatgi, AOR

Mr. Shubham Upadhyay, AOR

Mr. P. S. Sudheer, AOR
Mr. Sunny Choudhary, AOR
Mr. Siddhartha Jha, AOR
M/S. V. Maheshwari & Co., AOR

Mr. Mayank Aggarwal, AOR
Mr. Pradeep Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, AOR
Mr. Shovan Mishra, AOR
Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Sharma, AOR
Ms. Suman Kukrety, AOR
Mr. Naveen Kumar, AOR
Mr. P. K. Manohar, AOR
Mr. Vinod Sharma, AOR
Ms. Surbhi Mehta, AOR
Mr. Rajeev Singh, AOR
Ms. Parul Shukla, AOR
Mr. Prashant Kumar Umrao, AOR
Mr. Arun K. Sinha, AOR
Ms. Sakshi Kakkar, AOR
Mr. B. K. Pal, AOR

Mr. James P. Thomas, AOR
Mr. S. Gowthaman, AOR
Mr. A. Karthik, AOR
Mr. Rajiv Kumar Choudhry , AOR

Mr. Anurag Tandon, AOR

Ms. Dr. Monika Gusain, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, AOR
Mr. Hariom Yaduvanshi, Adv.
Mr. Arjun Yaduvanshi, Adv.
Ms. S. Harini, Adv.
Mr. Avi Dhankhar, Adv.
Mr. Vansmani Tripathi, Adv.
Ms. Aahana Jaiswal, Adv.
Ms. Drishti Rawal, Adv.
Ms. Drishti Saraf, Adv.

Mr. Omanakuttan K. K., AOR
Mr. Ajit Sharma, AOR
Ms. Shalini Kaul, AOR
Mr. Sunil Kumar Sharma, AOR

Ms. Swati Ghildiyal, AOR
Ms. Neha Singh, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Sharma, AOR
Mr. Raj Bahadur Yadav, AOR
Mr. Samir Ali Khan, AOR
Mr. Sachin Patil, AOR
Mr. Shubhanshu Padhi, AOR
Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, AOR
Mr. Nishit Agrawal, AOR
Mr. Krishna Ballabh Thakur, AOR
Ms. Aruna Gupta, AOR

Ms. K. Enatoli Sema, AOR
Mr. Amit Kumar Singh, Adv.
Ms. Chubalemla Chang, Adv.
Mr. Prang Newmai, Adv.

Mr. Shishir Deshpande, AOR
Mr. Yusuf, AOR
Mrs. Pragya Baghel, AOR
Ms. Deepanwita Priyanka, AOR
Mr. Raghvendra Kumar, AOR

Mr. Sravan Kumar Karanam, AOR
Mr. Kumar Abhishek, Adv.

Applicant-in-person, AOR
Mr. Anant Mann, AOR

Mr. Lakshmeesh S. Kamath, AOR
Mr. Gopal Balwant Sathe, AOR
Mr. Sarvam Ritam Khare, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G.
Mr. K. M. Nataraj A.S.G.
Mr. Shyam Gopal, Adv.
Ms. Suhasini Sen, Adv.
Mr. Raghav Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.
Mr. Harish Pandey, Adv.
Ms. Indira Bhakar, Adv.
Mr. Anuj Srinivas Udupa, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kant Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Piyush Beriwal, Adv.
Mr. Neeraj Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Ms. Mrinal Elker Mazumdar, Adv.
Mr. Shashwat Parihar, Adv.
Mr. Mukesh K Verma, Adv.
Mr. Vinayak Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Raman Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Ms. Sunieta Ojha, AOR
Mr. Dinesh Chandra Pandey, AOR

Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, AOR

Mr. Himinder Lal, AOR
Ms. Shruti Jose, AOR
Mr. Kaushik Choudhury, AOR

Mr. Aravindh S., AOR
Mr. Aman Gautam, Adv.

Mrs. Kirti Renu Mishra, AOR
Mr. Atul Sharma, AOR
Mr. Anirudh Sanganerla, AOR
Mr. Shrey Kapoor , AOR
Ms. Anne Mathew, AOR
Mr. Yash S. Vijay, AOR

Mr. Abhishek Atrey, AOR
Dr. Abhishek Atrey, Adv.
Ms. Ambika Atrey, Adv.

Ms. Mrinal Gopal Elker, AOR
Mr. Chinmoy Chaitanya, Adv.

Mr. Dhaval Mehrotra, AOR
Mr. Binay Kumar Das, AOR
Ms. Lakshmi N. Kaimal, AOR

Mr. Subhasish Mohanty, AOR
Mr. Rahul Jain, AOR
Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR
Mr. Naveen Kumar, AOR

Mr. V. N. Raghupathy, AOR

M/S. D.S.K. Legal, AOR
Ms. Shibani Ghosh, AOR
Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, AOR

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, ASG
Mr. Shiv Mangal Sharma, AAG
Mr. Saurabh Rajpal, Adv.
Ms. Nidhi Jaswal, AOR

Ms. Pallavi Langar, AOR
Mr. Rajeev Kumar Dubey, AOR
Mr. Rajeev Maheshwaranand Roy, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

[1] IN RE : CORBETT I.A. NO. 20650 of 2023 (CEC REPORT No. 3/2023 – Report of CEC in APPLN. No. 1558/2021 with I.A. NO. 75033 OF 2023 and I.A. No. 199355 of 2024 (CEC Report No. 16/2024 – INTERIM REPORT OF THE CEC ON APPLN. NO. 1578/2024)

1. Heard Mr. K. Parameshwar, learned Amicus Curiae and Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Mr. Gaurav Kumar Bansal, learned counsel appearing for the applicant.

2. Arguments concluded.

3. Judgment is reserved.

[2] I.A. Nos. 117782, 117783 AND 117785 of 2025 in W.P.(C) No. 202/1995

These applications have been filed by one Sanjay Kumar seeking the

following prayers:

- “a) Issue appropriate directions to the State of Rajasthan and the Union of India to take immediate and effective steps to regulate and restrict public access and vehicular traffic to Trinetra Ganesh Temple and other religious sites located within the Critical Tiger Habitat (CTH)/core zone of the Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve;
- b) Direct the complete cessation of all mining, stone crushing, and mineral transportation activities within the notified boundaries of the Critical Tiger Habitat (CTH) of Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve and within a 1 km radius therefrom;
- c) Direct the Union of India to deploy Central Paramilitary Forces, such as the Central Industrial Security Force (CISF), to support the enforcement of wildlife and forest laws in identified conflict zones within and around Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve;
- d) Direct the demolition and removal of all illegal structures and commercial establishments operating within the Core/CTH area of the Reserve, and restoration of the area to its original ecological state;
- e) Direct the State of Rajasthan to implement its Orders dated 26.12.2002 and 31.03.2015.”

2. The Applicant through these applications seeks to bring to the notice of this Court the illegal mining activities within the core area / Critical Tiger Habitat (hereinafter, “CTH”) of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve (or “Tiger Reserve”) and its surrounding areas.

3. The Applicant highlights the following issues:

3.1. Issue regarding religious gathering in Trinetra Ganesha

Temple: The Trinetra Ganesh Temple is situated inside the historic Ranthambore Fort which is approximately 5kms within the National Park. It is stated that on Wednesdays alone, the number of pilgrims exceeds 10,000, on Sundays the figure touches nearly 6,000 and on regular weekdays the footfall hovers around 2,500 visitors per day. It is further stated that the road leading from Ganesh Dham to Jogi Mahal Gate—a 6 km stretch—serves as the primary approach route to the Temple. This stretch, which lies entirely within the core zone of the Tiger Reserve, witnesses an alarming number of private vehicles, including cars, taxis, motorcycles, and even pedestrians. On certain days, upwards of 7,500 vehicles are illegally parked along the stretch, causing massive congestion and exposing high-density tiger zones to intrusive human presence. This influx of such large crowds results in

multiple direct and indirect harms to the fragile ecosystem. Pilgrims cook food using firewood extracted illegally from the Tiger Reserve, dispose of plastic waste in large quantities, and cause severe anthropogenic disturbances to the wildlife, particularly tigers and other keystone species.

3.2 Illegal mining activities within Core/CTH area of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve: It is stated that approx. 150 ha of land situated adjacent to Uliyana village within the CTH of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve is affected by extensive illegal mining activities. The mining operations in Uliyana involve usage of heavy machinery and repeated movement of dumpers and tractor trolleys.

3.3 Illegal Commercial Constructions & Encroachments in Ranthambore Tiger Reserve: The third issue pertains to rampant commercial encroachments and unauthorized constructions within CTH of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve. Despite prohibition by the State of Rajasthan, illegal constructions have continued unabated. It is further stated that the Kachida Mataji Temple located inside the Tiger Reserve, has been continuously and unlawfully expanding over the years. The Pilgrims visiting the temple regularly throw plastic waste inside the forest area.

3.4. Delay in notification of ESZ around Ranthambore Tiger

Reserve: The Applicant states that despite efforts and steps taken by Ministry of Environment and Forest & Climate Change (for short 'MoEF&CC'), the State of Rajasthan has not taken any steps for the protection and conservation of CTH of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve. Due to non-declaration of ESZ of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve – hotels, motels, farm houses, residential colonies, commercial spaces – are growing inside the CTH of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve.

3.5 Conservation of historic structures within Ranthambore

Tiger Reserve: The Applicant also seeks to highlight that there are various historic structures situated in the Ranthambore Tiger Reserve like Jogi Mahal, Battees Khamba, Bada Mahal, Ranthambhore Fort, Jain Temple, etc. It is submitted that the said historic structures are not being properly maintained. It is therefore submitted that necessary directions are required to be issued in this regard.

4. We have heard Shri K. Parameshwar, learned Amicus Curiae appearing in the matter and Shri Shiv Mangal Sharma, the Additional Advocate General for the State of Rajasthan.

5. On a previous occasion this Court was required to consider a similar issue pertaining to the Sariska Tiger Reserve. After considering the submissions of the learned Amicus Curiae as well as the learned counsel for the State of Rajasthan, this Court had passed the following

order on 11th December 2024 in ***Suo-Moto Writ Petition (C) No.1 of 2023:***

“1. The present matter concerns various issues with regard to the problem faced in Sariksa Tiger Reserve. The Court has passed several orders from time to time. The first order was passed on 12.07.2023, followed by a second order on 13.03.2024 and the last order was passed on 07.08.2024.

2. In pursuance to the aforesaid orders, the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) has examined the issue and has given 25 suggestions. The State had filed an affidavit dated 10.09.2024, thereby agreeing to almost all the suggestions given by the CEC. However, the time-lines given in the recommendations/suggestions are not practical and those timelines will have to be extended.

3. Mr. K. Parameshwar, learned Amicus Curiae as well as Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned Additional Solicitor General agree that insofar as recommendation Nos. (XII), (XV) and (XVI) are concerned, taking into consideration the various aspects, certain directions are necessary to be issued. Recommendation No. XII reads as under:

“XII. In Sariska Tiger Reserve, the area of Sariska Wildlife sanctuary (492.00 Sq. Km.) is a smaller than the area of its declared Critical Tiger Habitat (881.11 Sq. Km.). Also, given that the Critical Tiger Habitat is fragmented, this leads to both legal as well as management challenges. Hence, Critical Tiger Habitat of STR should be rationalized based on the pattern of tiger breeding while ensuring that the total area of CTH after rationalization does not decrease rather the area of the Sariska Wildlife sanctuary should be increased. It must be ensured that such rationalized boundaries of Sanctuary become coterminous with the Core/Critical Tiger Habitat of the Sariska Tiger Reserve. This should be done before 30.09.2024.”

4. To implement the directions for rationalizing the total area of the Sariska Wildlife Sanctuary, the State will have to follow the procedure prescribed under the Act and the Rules framed thereunder.

5. The procedure involves the issuance of draft notification

inviting objections, followed by presenting the same before the National Board for Wildlife.

6. The environmentalists have raised certain concerns that the process of rationalization would result in additional mining activities. On the other hand, the miners have expressed their concerns that while rationalizing the area, the process would affect the existing mining activities which are otherwise legal.

7. In the prescribed procedure, the State is required to invite objections and consider the same. As such, any objections expressed by environmentalists or miners can be raised before the State after the draft notification is issued. The State would be required to take these objections into consideration. In any case, the alteration of the boundaries can be permitted only after receiving approval from this Court in pursuance to the order dated 30.11.2000 in IA No. 2 of 1996 in W.P.(C) No. 337 of 1995.

8. We, therefore, expect the State to follow the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 and Rules framed thereunder for carrying out the exercise under recommendation No.XII.

9. The trust which manages the Pandupole Hanuman Mandir and the devotees have also raised some grievance with regard to Recommendation No.I, which reads as under:

“I. All private vehicles plying to Pandupole Hanuma Temple from all the three existing gates should be stopped and Electric Shuttle Buses should be put in place for the pilgrims and other visitors by the State Government latest by 31.03.2025. This needs to be followed by exploring the other options discussed in para 44 like tram way/elevated road/motorable twin tunnel/rope way & sky walk on the basis of appropriate feasibility studies and alignments, the decision on which can be taken by State Government, in consultation with NTCA within a period of next one-year.”

10. It is not in dispute that while protecting the Tiger Reserve as well as the Sanctuary, the sentiments of the devotees, who visit the temple, should also be given due consideration. It is the concern of the Trust and the devotees that immediate stopping of private vehicles would deprive the thousands of devotees who come on Tuesdays and Saturdays from visiting

the temple.

11. It is also their concern that there is a belief among the devotees that they should offer a prasad on fulfillment of their prayers. The grievances have also been raised with regard to Recommendation Nos. XV and XVI which banned the preparation/cooking of sawamani/bhandara in the temple premises and any kind of food items at the shop run by the temple trust in the temple premises, with immediate effect. They read as under:

“XV. Preparation/cooking of sawamani/bhandara in the Pandupole Hanuman Mandir premises should be strictly banned with immediate effect. The practice of pilgrims bringing bhog/prasad with them, prepared outside the tiger reserve to the Hanuman temple can be allowed.

XVI. Preparation/cooking of any kind of food items at the shop run by the temple trust in the temple premises should be banned with immediate effect. Sale of prepared bhog/prasad brought from outside the Tiger Reserve can be allowed.”

12. We, therefore, find it appropriate that before implementing Recommendation Nos. (I), (XII), (XV) and (XVI), the Committee consisting of following Members should be appointed which can address these concerns and find out solutions in a phased manner:

- (i) The Collector, Sariksha;
- (ii) The Field Director, Sariksha Tiger Reserve; and
- (iii) A Member of the CEC.

13. The said Committee shall give a hearing also to the representative of the Trust and arrive at a solution in a balanced and phased manner so that the interest of the Tiger Reserve as well as the concerns of the devotees are given due consideration.

14. The deadline given in the Recommendations of the report of the CEC would not be practical inasmuch insofar as same aspects are concerned as the outer dates are already over.

15. We, therefore, extend the period as provided in the guidelines by one year from today.”

6. We find that, taking into consideration the similarity of the situation, it will be appropriate that a Committee of the following Members is appointed which can address the concerns with regard to the issue in Ranthambore Tiger Reserve and recommend solutions in a phased manner:

- (i) The Collector, Sawai Madhopur
- (ii) The Field Director, Ranthambore Tiger Reserve; and
- (iii) A member of the CEC

7. Needless to state that while addressing the issue pertaining to the maintenance and conservation of Tiger Reserve, the Committee so constituted shall also take into consideration the interest of the devotees of the Trinetra Ganesha temple and give suggestions which would balance the interest of the Tiger Reserve as well as the devotees.

8. The said Committee shall also give a hearing to the representatives of various stakeholders including the representatives of the Trust which manages the Trinetra Ganesha Temple.

9. In order to protect the Ranthambore Tiger Reserve, we also deem it appropriate to direct the State of Rajasthan to take steps to ban mining in the core area of the Tiger Reserve. Needless to clarify that the ban on mining in the core area of Tiger Reserve shall scrupulously be followed without permitting any interference from any of the stakeholders. The State of Rajasthan shall, accordingly, file an affidavit

within a period of 6 weeks from today stating as to what steps it has taken for prohibiting mining in the core area of Ranthambore Tiger Reserve.

(DEEPAK SINGH)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(ANJU KAPOOR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR