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Citation of the Cases The Hon’ble Supreme Court held as

Under

In Narmada Bachao Andolan Vs

. Union of India,(2000) 10SCC664

Any delay in the execution of the project means

oyerrun in costs and the decision to under take

a project; if challenged after its execution has

commenced, should be thrown out at the very

threshold on the ground of laches if the

petitioner had the knowlwdge of such a

decision and could have approached the court

at that time. Just because a petition is termed

as a PIL does not means that ordinary principles

applicable to litigation will not apply. Laches is

one of them.