

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

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 1086/2020  
IN W.P.(C) DIARY NO. 10817/2020

FOUNDATION FOR MEDIA PROFESSIONALS

PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR &amp; ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

(FOR APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS ON IA 54114/2020  
IA No. 54114/2020 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS)

Date : 23-02-2024 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MEHTA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Shadan Farasat, AOR  
Ms. Warisha Farasat, Adv.  
Mr. Gautam Bhatia, Adv.  
Ms. Vrinda Bhandari, Adv.  
Mr. Abhinav Sekhri, Adv.  
Ms. Gayatri Malhotra, Adv.  
Ms. Radhika Roy, Adv.  
Mr. Harshit Anand, Adv.  
Mr. Aman Naqvi, Adv.  
Ms. Hrishika Jain, Adv.  
Ms. Natasha Maheshaawari, Adv.  
Ms. Mreganka Kukreja, Adv.  
Mr. Abhishek Babbar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General  
Mr. K.M. Nataraj, A.S.G.  
Mr. Kanu Agrawal, A.A.G.  
Mr. Pashupathi Nath Razdan, AOR  
Mr. Parth Awasthi, Adv.  
Ms. Maitreyee Jagat Joshi, Adv.  
Mr. Astik Gupta, Adv.

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

1. Though this application has been filed seeking various prayers. During the course of hearing, Shri Shadan Farasat, learned counsel for the applicant(s), submitted that this Court in

the case of Anuradha Bhasin v. Union of India and Others, reported in (2020) 3 SCC 637, has held that even the review orders are required to be published but the same is not being done.

2. Though the same is not a prayer in this application, taking into consideration that even the review orders would result in affecting the rights of the parties, we had considered the said prayer.

3. the order dated 30.01.2024 would show that Shri K.M. Natraj, learned Additional Solicitor General of India appearing for Respondent No.1, submitted that the deliberations are not required to be published.

4. We expressed our prima facie opinion to the effect that though it may not be necessary to publish the deliberations, however, the orders passed in the review would be required to be published.

5. We find that the stand of the Respondent No.1 is just and fair.

6. Shri Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General of India appearing for Respondent No.1, himself has stated that there should be no impediment in publishing the final order of review.

7. We accept the said statement.

8. We clarify that though it may not be necessary to notify the deliberations of the Reviewing Committee, it will be necessary to publish the final order.

9. The application is, accordingly, disposed of.

(NARENDRA PRASAD)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(ANJU KAPOOR)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)