



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11082/2025

Basant Hotels Private Limited, Having Its Registered Office At Alka Hotel, Near Shashtri Circle, Udaipur, Through Its Director, Nishit Bhandari Son Of Shri Kamal Prakash Bhandari, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of 29-A, Alkapuri, Fatehsagar Lake, Udaipur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Urban Development And Housing Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Town Planning Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Udaipur Development Authority Udaipur, Through Its Commissioner, Udaipur.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. M.S. Singhvi, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Vineet Dave & Mr. Kaushik Dave
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Vijay Purohit Mr. Shubham Ojha

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUNNURI LAXMAN

Order

28/05/2025

1. Mr. M.S. Singhvi, learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner, submits that initially, the petitioner was granted permission for construction for a limited period. There are allegations that the petitioner has carried out construction during the period when no valid permission existed. Additionally, it is alleged that the petitioner violated the *e-policy* of 2018. However, Mr. Singhvi argues that the impugned order does not specify which constructions were made outside the authorized period granted



[CW-11082/2025]

under the original permission. He further contends that the *e-policy* of 2024 is not applicable to the petitioner and that the constructions were carried out in accordance with the *e-policy* of 2018.

2. Learned counsel for the respondents submits that the impugned demolition orders pertain to unauthorized constructions, which allegedly violated the *e-policy* of 2018. However, he also acknowledges that since no reply has been filed, any interim order granted at this stage may affect the respondents' right to file a reply and seek vacation of the *ex-parte* interim orders.

3. In view of the above and the nature of the consequences arising from the impugned order, this Court is inclined to direct both parties to maintain the status quo as it exists today, until the next date of hearing.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents is granted liberty to file a reply and to move an application for vacation of the interim order.

5. Post the matter on 21.07.2025.

(MUNNURI LAXMAN),J

247s-PoonamS/-