

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

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s). 36197/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 06-08-2024 in DBCSAW No. 467/2024 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur]

SINGHANIA UNIVERSITY

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF RAJASTHAN & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 187528/2024 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
IA No. 181724/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED
JUDGMENT, IA No. 53014/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.
IA No. 78052/2025 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 69428/2025 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 18085/2025 - INTERVENTION/IMPLEADMENT
IA No. 181719/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE SLP WITHOUT CERTIFIED/PLAIN
COPY OF IMPUGNED ORDER)

Date : 07-04-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH**

**For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Mahesh Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Madhavi Agarwal, Adv.
Mr. Arshit Anand, Adv.
Mr. Aslam Ahamed, Adv.
Mr. Rohit Jain, Adv.
Mr. Harilal S, Adv.
Ms. Aayushi, Adv.
Mr. E.C. Agrawala, AOR**

**For Respondent(s) : Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prateek Bhatia, AOR
Mr. Dhawal Mohan, Adv.
Mr. Paranjay Tirpathi, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Raj, Adv.**

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed by
NARENDRA PRASAD
Date: 2025.04.09
17:21:17 IST
Reason: 

**Ms. Rekha Palli, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Chritarth Palli, AOR
Mr. S.. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR
Ms. Bhuvneshwari Pathak, AOR**

Mr. Manoj Ranjan Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Mrigank Prabhakar, AOR
Mr. Vishal Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Siddharth Sahu, Adv.

Mr. Rahul Kaushik, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Bhuvneshwari Pathak, Adv.
Mr. Shivam Parashar, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Ranjan Sinha, Adv.
Mr. Vishal Agrawal, Adv.

Mr. S. Udaya Kumar Sagar, AOR

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

1. We do not find any error in the concurrent orders passed by the learned Single Judge as well as the learned Division Bench of the High Court.
2. Before the learned Single Judge an objection was raised on behalf of the petitioner that since the learned Single Judge who was hearing the matter had appeared in one of the matters, as a Senior Standing Counsel for the Income Tax Authorities, wherein one of the issues was involved was identical with one of the issues involved in the present lis.
3. However, the learned Single Judge found that the issue involved in the said matters, where he appeared as a Standing Counsel, was a different one than the issues involved in the present matter before him. The same has been upheld by the Division Bench in the appeal.
4. We do not find any error in the approach taken either by the learned Single Judge or the Division Bench of the High Court. However, it is always said that justice should not only be done but also seen to be done.
5. If any of the parties has an apprehension, normally the Courts themselves should recuse from hearing of the said matters.
6. Though, we are not interfering with the interim impugned order, we only advise the learned Single Judge to follow the well established principle stated hereinabove.
7. Needless to state that interim order passed by this Court

stand vacated.

8. However, since the proceedings initiated at the behest of the present petitioners have been prolonged for a long time before the High Court, we request the learned Single Judge to whom the matter would be assigned to decide the proceedings expeditiously.

9. The special leave petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

10. Pending application(s), including applications for impleadment/intervention, shall stand disposed of.

(NARENDRA PRASAD)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(ANJU KAPOOR)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR