

(2026) 03 SC CK 1472

In the Supreme Court Of India

Case No : Writ Petition (Civil) No. 4677 Of 1985

M.C. Mehta

APPELLANT

Vs

Union Of India And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 11-03-2026

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2026) 03 SC CK 1472

Hon'ble Judges : Surya Kant, CJI;Joymalya Bagchi, J;Vipul M. Pancholi, J

Bench : Full Bench

Advocate : S. Guru Krishna Kumar, Anitha Shenoy, Manan Verma, Dr. Surender Singh Hooda, M/S. Parekh & Co., Ashwani Kumar, Rachana Joshi Issar, Prashant Chaudhary, Harish Pandey, V. K. Verma, Rekha Pandey, Reepak Kansal, Rahul Kumar, Eliza Gupta, Diwas Kumar, Ajay Kumar, Shama Praveen, Ruhi Gupta, Ritesh Dhir, Himanshi Bagri, Pravir Choudhary, Nikilesh Ramachandran, Prerna Mehta, Sunil Kumar Jain, Ravi Kumar Tomar, Gurmeet Singh Makker, Tejaswi Kumar Pradhan, Manoranjan Paikaray, Pranab Kumar Samantray, Pradeep Kar, P. Parmeswaran, Gunnam Venkateswara Rao, Abhay Kumar, Diva Singh, Devendra Singh, Avinash Poddar, Bhupender Yadav, Karan Thakur, Swagat Nanda, A. Venayagam Balan, Praveen Swarup, Sanjiv Sen, Sr. Praveen Swarup, Rohit Swarup, Saurabh Rohilla, Sakshi Chahar, Punit Handa, Anil Kumar Gupta, Dr. Vivek Verma, Binu Tamta, Shekhar Kumar, Anil Katiyar, Anu Gupta, Manju Jetley, Sharmila Upadhyay, Satish Aggarwal, Satyendra Kumar, Ajit Sharma, Suresh Chandra Tripathy, Sudhir Naagar, Md. Farman, Ruby Singh Ahuja, Venkateswara Rao Anumolu, Abhijit Sengupta, Paras Chauhan, Kuheli Mitra, Navneet Singh, Deependra Kumar Pathak, Vishal Kumar Singh, S. K. Mehta, Alok Singh, Neeraj Kumar Gupta, Tarun Johri, Avinash Kr. Lakhanpal, Sanjay Kapur, Pranaya Kumar Mohapatra, T. L. Garg, Shiv Prakash Pandey, Rukhsana Choudhury, Harsh V. Surana, Raj Kamal, Himinder Lal, Arvind Kumar Sharma, S. S. Shroff, Firdouse Qutb Wani, Kamal Mohan Gupta, Sunny Choudhary, D. K. Devesh, Kailas Bajirao Autade, Anand Varma, Shekhar Prit Jha, Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, Prithu Garg, Krishnanand Pandeya, Neha Sharma, Smarhar Singh, Rajesh Kumar, Shweta Kumari, Mohd Asim, Pankaj Prakash, Mr. Siddhartha Chowdhury, Dr. L.S. Chaudhary, Dr. Ajay Chaudhary, Vinita, Monika Chaudhary, Bharat Chaudhary, D.s. Chaudhary, Parambir Singh, Vishesh Kumar, Anjale Patel, Sanjeev Malhotra, Varun Varma, Sarthak Upadhyaya, Susmita Singh, Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Shray Sashank, Aakash Choudhary, T. Hari Hara Sudhan, Himali Choudhary, Jatin Malik, Ramesh Kumar Mishra, Arvind Gupta, Vivek Narayan Sharma, Mahima Bhardwaj

Kalucha, Mrs. Manisha Rore, Rajeev Kumar Jha, Akash Pratap Singh, Akash Singh, Ravindra Kumar, Sr. Binay Kumar Das, Priyanka Das, Neha Das, Shivam Saksena, Vikas Bharti, Guntur Pramod Kumar, Abinash Kumar Mishra, Nidhi Mohan Parashar, Purna Chandra Patnaik, Anand Singh, S. Santanam Swaminadhan, Mrs. Aarthi Rajan, Abhilasha Shrawat, Kartik Malhotra, Karunakar Mahalik, Manoj Kumar, Yash Thakur, Abhinav Agrawal, Avadh Bihari Kaushik, Amarjit Singh Bedi, Vishnu Sharma, Anupama Sharma, Amar Jyoti Sharma, Parinita Sehrawat, Kartikeya Chaudhary, Mrs. Gargi Khanna, Somnath Mukherjee, Mayuri Raghuvanshi, Saurabh Mishra, Shrimay Mishra, Abhinav Pandey, Yoginder Handoo, Dr. Arvind S. Avhad, Madhu Sikri, K. V. Mohan, Arjun Garg, Shrey Kapoor, Vivek Gupta, A. Raghunath, Prakash Ranjan Nayak, Tejaswi Kumar Pradhan, Manoranjan Paikaray, Pranab Kumar Samantray, Pradeep Kar, Ambhoj Kumar Sinha, Binu Tamta, Rani Chhabra, Vishnu Kant, V. N. Raghupathy, E. C. Agrawala, Prashant Bhushan, Alok Gupta, Sharmila Upadhyay, R. C. Kohli, T. V. George, Smita Maan, Tarun Gupta, Abhinav Shrivastava, Gauraan, Vivek Narayan Sharma, Mahima Bhardwaj Kalucha, Mrs. Manisha Rore, Rajeev Kumar Jha, Akash Pratap Singh, Akash Singh, Vinayak Sharma, Standing Counsel, Ravinder Kumar Yadav, M/S. Unuc Legal LLP, D S Mehra, M/S. Mitter & Mitter Co., Bimlesh Kumar Singh, Lokesh Sinhal, Sr. A.A.G. Mr. B. K. Satija, A.A.G. Mr. Rahul Khurana, Samar Vijay Singh, Sabarni Som, Aman Dev Sharma, Gaj Singh, Keshav Mittal, B. Chandra Sekaran, Amit Shrivastava, Vaibhav Vikram Singh, S. Guru Krishna Kumar, Amicus Curiae Ms. Anitha Shenoy, Amicus Curiae Ms. Srishti Agnihotri, Ashwin K, Vishesh Goel, Sadhana Madhavan, Kavana Rao, Tara Elizabeth Kurien, D.p.singh, Anchal Kanthad, Pallavi Tayal, M/S. Karanjawala & Co., Anand Mishra, Dinesh Chandra Pandey, Raj Bahadur Yadav, Aishwarya Bhati, Navanjay Mahapatra, Rajat Nair, Rajesh Kumar Singh, Annirudh Sharma II, S.s.rebello, Suhasini Sen, Sabarish Subramanian, Dr. Arun Kumar Yadav, Kiran Kumar Patra, Rajesh Kumar Chaurasia, Richa Kapoor, Akshay Verma, Malvika Kapila, Ashok Anand, Ejaz Maqbool, Chanchal Kumar Ganguli, Dr. Surender Singh Hooda, Siddharth Sengar, Shantanu Krishna, Anant Prakash, Vaishnavi Srivastava, Ekansh Mishra, Aishwarya Bhati LD, K.M. Nataraj LD, Mukesh Kumar Maroria, Jagdish Chandra, Rajesh Kumar Singh, Rajat Nair, Suhasini Sen, Navnajay Mahapatra, T.S. Sabarish, Madhav Sinhal, Sunanda Shukla, Mayank Pandey, A. Sirajudeen, P.V. Yogeswaran, Sharath Nambiar, B.K. Satija, Shradha Deshmukh, Chitransh Sharma, Sarthak Karol, Manish, Kailash Prashad Pandey, Varun Varma, Hitesh Kumar Sharma, Amit Kumar Chawla, Akhileshwar Jha, Kailash Parsad Pandey, Shreya Jha, Manisha Chawla, Swati Vishan, Charanjeet Sidhu, Niharika Dwivedi, Ritika Raj, Rashmi Prava Mohanty, Saurabh Kumar Solanki, Sandeep Singh Dingra, Anupam Kumar, Jogender Kumar, Pawan Kumar, Manoj Kumar, Prince Raj, Bagat Ram, Honey Sharma, Sandeep Kumar Sharma, Raghavendra Pratap Singh, Ilin Saraswat, Mrs. Ilma Saifi, Mrs. Anita Rani Sharma, Mrs. Poonam Seth, Ajay Prakash, M. M. Kashyap, K. V. Bharathi Upadhyaya, Sufyan Hasan, Pritama, Shaivani Gupta, D Poornima, Dr. Sunita, Hema Malik, Rooh-e-hina Dua, Haresh Raichura, Saroj Raichura, Shagun Matta, Samir Malik, Krishna Pal Singh, Sudarshan Lamba, Rakesh Mishra, Chandra Kant, Akshit Tyagi, Amit Upreti, Bharat Bhushan, Sakshi Tiwari, Pratyaksh Semwal, Milind Kumar, Udit Singh, Anuradha Mutatkar, Chirag M. Shroff, Shyam D. Nandan, Priya Puri, Intervenor-in-person, Abhas Kumar, M/S. M. V. Kini & Associates, Rajivkumar, Manoj K. Mishra, Paresh Upadhyay, Umesh Dubey, Madhulika, Anand Kumar Rai, Radeesh Kumar Mt, Amulya Dev Mishra, Aishwarya Bhati, Suhasini Sen, Rajesh Kumar Singh, Rajat Nair, T S Sabarish, Navanjay Mahapatra, Annirudh Sharma - II, Amrish Kumar, Supriya Juneja, Anand Shankar, Zeeshan Diwan, Ajay Kumar Singh, Akriti Chaubey, Pratibha Jain, Ajay Pal,

Shekhar G Devasa, Sr. Manish Tiwari, Mrs. Thashmitha Muthanna, Rakesh Kini, Shashi Bhushan Nagar, M/S. Devasa & Co., Astha Sharma, Aishwarya Bhati, A.S.G. Ms. Chitrangda Rastravara, Shagun Thakur, B K Satija, Ruchi Kohli, Rajat Nair, Suhasini Sen, Chinmayee Chandra, Dr. N. Visakamurthy, Ajay Vikram Singh, Priyanka Singh, M Aamir Faiyaz, Rehan Khan, Rahul Vikram Singh, Jasmeet Singh, Rahul Narayan, Dhananjay Garg, B. Vijayalakshmi Menon, Nishit Agrawal, Rakhi Ray, Manika Tripathy, Mayank Aggarwal, Pradeep Kumar Aggarwal, T. Mahipal, Rajat Joseph, Gaurav Goel, Umesh Kumar Khaitan, Vanita Bhargava, Amit Kumar Singh, K. Enatoli Sema, Chubalemla Chang, Prang Newmai, Anando Mukherjee, Shwetank Singh, Mrs. Riya Dhingra, Utkarsh Anand, Lokesh Sinhal, B.K. Satija, Rakesh Kumar Mudgal, A.A.G. Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, Rahul Khurana, Nikunj Gupta, Sarthak Arya, Sarthak Srivastava, Mayur Goyal, Seema Sindhu, Abhishek Chand, Deepak Vashisht,

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Surya Kant, CJI

1. This Writ Petition is the second-oldest case pending before this Court. The instant petition, filed in 1985, is among the three long- standing Writ Petitions instituted by Shri M.C. Mehta, seeking invocation of this Court's writ jurisdiction towards the protection and conservation of the environment and the country's natural resources. Similar to Writ Petition (Civil) No. 13381/1984, which we have disposed of through an even-dated judgement, this Writ Petition has also evolved in nature and grown in scope, necessitating a similar step to reshape the efforts of this Court.

A. THE EVOLUTION OF THIS WRIT PETITION

2. The original grievance prompting the filing of the Writ Petition was the proliferation of unauthorised industries, especially heavy and noxious units, in the erstwhile Union Territory of Delhi. The thrust of the Petitioner's submissions lay in the substantial environmental degradation suffered by the ecology, as well as the negative impact on the metropolitan planning in the territory. As the case was taken up from time to time, this Court addressed different issues regarding the use and misuse of land and other natural resources in Delhi. At its core, this Court engaged with the legislative and policy framework surrounding the Master Plans for Delhi, their rampant violation by private entities, and the inaction of authorities like the Municipal Corporation of Delhi in addressing these illegalities.

A.1 Shifting of Hazardous Industries

3. The first major step to prevent unauthorised use of land came in the form of two judgements, dated 15.05.1992 and 08.07.1996. Through the former, this Court barred the operation of any stone crusher in the erstwhile Union Territory of Delhi, keeping in view its polluting impact on the air, water, and land. A wider closure exercise, involving 168 industries identified to be 'highly polluting', was mandated through the latter decision, along with directions to the Delhi Pollution

Control Committee to initiate action against 762 other units. It was noticed on both occasions that the establishment and operation of these units violated the land use norms in force at the time.

A.2 Action Against Misuse of Residential Property

4. Over subsequent years, while overseeing the implementation of the above directions, this Court also initiated action against industrial and commercial activities in residential premises. In doing so, a regulatory gap was noticed when it came to addressing the misuse of residential premises for commercial or industrial purposes. Hence, through a judgment dated 16.02.2006, the Municipal Corporation of Delhi was directed to ensure cessation of commercial activities in residential buildings and sealing of non-compliant properties. Subsequently, to ensure a thorough scrutiny of these violations, this responsibility was finally vested in a Monitoring Committee constituted through an order dated 24.03.2006.

5. It is reported to us that as on 09.09.2025, the Monitoring Committee has disposed of 1399 out of 1443 complaints received by it, by either rejecting the complaint or ordering appropriate action.

6. This Court, taking into account the volume of challenges raised against orders/reports of the Monitoring Committee, also set up an appellate mechanism in the form of a Judicial Committee comprising two former High Court Judges to hear the applications assailing the decisions of the Monitoring Committee. We are informed by the Judicial Committee that, as of 12.11.2025, out of approximately 1380 applications filed before it, 1300 have been heard and disposed of, while the remaining 80 are pending at different stages.

A.3 Expansion of the Scope of the Instant Writ Petition

7. This Court has also, from time to time, exercised judicial oversight on the evolving policy regarding the regulation of land use in the NCT of Delhi. Its role in the instant Petition has grown from an enforcer of the law to a protector of the rights of common citizenship. This evolution has led this Court to address critical issues such as the reduction of green cover in Delhi, mining activities in the NCT, and groundwater depletion in the region. The changes in the regulatory regime, such as ordinances regularising misuse of residential premises and newer Master Plans for Delhi, have also prompted various parties to file applications challenging or defending these legislative and policy decisions.

8. The instant proceedings have, thus, taken the shape of a continuing mandamus, covering a substantially wider scope than envisaged in the original petition filed by Shri Mehta. As of today, 433 Interlocutory Applications, filed by different parties and seeking a variety of reliefs, are pending in this Writ Petition. Further, several issues concerning land use in Delhi have been identified and taken up suo moto by this Court.

9. It is clear that the role of this Court in the context of the instant Writ Petition

has significantly expanded since 1985. However, the proceedings have continued under a singular case number, leading to all the spheres of consideration, having diverse backgrounds, legal regimes, and interested stakeholders, taking the shape of Interlocutory Applications, rather than independent cases. Such a mechanism may have been suitable for the narrower scope of the original Writ Petition, but its present extent and coverage pose significant administrative difficulties in the management, listing, and consistent adjudication of such applications.

10. Additionally, although the petition was lodged in 1985, the issues grasping judicial attention today are of a markedly contemporary nature. Indian jurisprudence on matters of preservation of the ecology, environment, and natural resources in urban zones has also become refined, and the adjudication by this Court is now in a different context. For instance, while the original closure of hazardous industries in 1992 and 1996 was prompted by the urban authorities' inaction, now a sustained adjudicatory and appellate framework in the form of the Monitoring Committee and the Judicial Committee has been established. The newer initiatives of this Court are based on the context of sustained judicial directions and the consequential administrative action.

11. Considering the expanded scope of the issues before this Court and the distinct jurisprudential and administrative context, it is important that these proceedings also be given a different shape. The objective is to organise the various issues pending consideration and, thereafter, address these concerns in a detailed and focused fashion. We have attempted to achieve the same objective through the even dated judgement passed in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 13381/1984. In our considered opinion, permitting the present system of ever-increasing IAs to continue would be against the interest of judicial efficiency.

12. With this in mind, the learned Amici Curiae, Mr. Guru Krishnakumar and Ms. Anita Shenoy, Senior Advocates, were requested on 23.02.2026 to categorise the pending IAs and identify if the same had been rendered infructuous.

B. BRIEF NOTE BY THE AMICI

13. The learned Amici have informed during the course of hearing that they have initiated this process, but due to the volume of filings, they are yet to complete the same. That being so, they have also supplied a brief note delineating the background of the petition, the status of some of the issues pending consideration, and the proposed categorisation of issues. At this stage, we consider it apposite to refer to some key aspects highlighted in the note.

14. Firstly, we observe that, to some extent, the issue of mining in the Aravalli Hills and Ranges was being taken up in these proceedings, and a few IAs pertaining thereto remain pending. The Amici have acknowledged that this Court is already comprehensively taking up the issues regarding mining and other environmentally sensitive activities in the Aravalli region in Suo Moto Writ Petition (Civil) No.10/2025 'In Re: Definition of Aravalli Hills and Ranges and

Ancillary Issues.'. In our view, it would be appropriate that such IAs are disposed of with liberty to the parties and counsel to assist this Court in that suo moto case so as to come to a conclusive finding in that case.

15. In the same breath, we may also note that the Amici have included consideration of (i) industries which contribute to the growing air pollution in Delhi and NCR and (ii) conserving and improving the green cover in Delhi as identified categories of issues to be considered by this Court. However, it must also be acknowledged that this Court is taking a comprehensive view on curbing air pollution in NCR in another case, i.e., Writ Petition (Civil) No. 13029/1985. Through a subsequent order, we anticipate that new Suo Moto Writ Petitions would be registered to reshape the proceedings therein. It may, thus, be more appropriate that the issues relating to air pollution in Delhi be taken up as a part of those proceedings.

16. Secondly, it has been suggested that various categories of IAs, such as those challenging the Master Plan for Delhi, 2021 and those relating to alleged encroachment on public lands, may be transferred to the Delhi High Court to be considered as part of its jurisdiction under Article 226. This would result in a lesser burden for this Court at the original stage, while also recognising the closeness of the High Court to the local issues involved. We are inclined to accept this proposal, not only for the reasons aforesaid but also keeping in mind the concurrent and expansive jurisdiction held by the High Court(s) on such issues. It goes without saying that in such circumstances, the High Court shall be bound by the previous orders passed by this Court from time to time.

17. Finally, the learned Amici have also recommended that the pending IAs and other issues identified by this Court may be taken up through fresh suo moto cases. There is strength in this proposal of the learned Amici Curiae. It is certainly in the interest of justice that we formally dispose of the instant Writ Petition. Any issues that survive would, instead, be addressed through newly registered cases.

C. DIRECTIONS

18. In the above context and in an attempt to bring order and efficiency in its adjudication of the issues pending in this Writ Petition, we issue the following directions:

- (i) The instant Writ Petition stands formally disposed of;
- (ii) In its place, the Registry shall register two new Suo Moto Writ Petitions (Civil), with the following titles, to consider the delineated issues:
 - (a) "Regulation of Hazardous Industries in the National Capital Region," including IAs regarding de-sealing or similar reliefs for 'hazardous' industries and those units which do not adhere to the applicable Master Plan for Delhi, but not including IAs regarding closure of industries due to violation of regulations pertaining to air pollution; and

(b) "Protection of Water Resources and Prevention of Water Pollution in the National Capital Region," including management of illegal waste discharge and unscientific misuse and depletion of groundwater; and

(iii) No new Interlocutory Application(s) or Miscellaneous Application(s) shall hitherto be entertained by the Registry in the instant Writ Petition or in the new suo moto cases, till further orders.

19. The Interlocutory Applications pending in the instant Writ Petition shall be dealt with in the manner explained hereafter:

(i) The concerned AOR (which would include Party-in-Person) who has filed the IA shall inform the Registry as to whether the IA has become infructuous due to orders passed by this Court or the efflux of time. If the AOR does not approach the Registry for the above purpose on or before 15.05.2026, it shall be presumed that the respective IA has been rendered infructuous;

(ii) If the AOR states that a particular IA has not become infructuous, he or she shall also place a note containing (i) the subject matter of the IA; (ii) the details of the Applicant(s); (iii) the prayer sought; and (iv) the reason why the same is not already covered by the orders passed by this Court;

(iii) Meanwhile, the learned Amici Curiae, in collaboration with the learned counsel for Union of India, the States of Haryana, Rajasthan, Punjab, and Uttar Pradesh, and the NCT of Delhi, are requested to undertake a similar exercise and identify the various IAs that have been rendered infructuous, but are yet to be formally disposed of;

(iv) All the IAs, where the Amici and the respective AOR(s) are ad idem that the same are infructuous, shall be listed as Miscellaneous Applications before the Registrar Court for their final disposal;

(v) The IAs, which, according to the learned Amici, have become infructuous but remain pending as per the respective AOR(s), shall be marked as 'disputed'. Such IAs shall be listed as Miscellaneous Applications before the Registrar Court for determining whether the matter requires further consideration of this Court; and

(vi) The IAs, which the Amici have indicated require further consideration shall be transferred as follows:

(a) The IAs which pertain to regulation of land-use in the NCT of Delhi, validity and implementation of the Delhi Master Plan, and other ancillary issues, including illegal construction, misuse of land, encroachment on public land, challenges to the Master Plan for Delhi, 2021, and appeals/challenges to orders of the Monitoring Committee and the Judicial Committee, stand transferred to the High Court of Delhi;

(b) All the IAs pertaining to the definition of Aravalli Hills and Ranges, the activities permissible thereon, and other ancillary issues shall be transferred to

Suo Moto Writ Petition (C) No. 10/2025;

(c) The IAs regarding (i) the cutting of trees, protection of the Ridge and Morphological Ridge Forest, tree census, and enhancement of tree coverage in Delhi, and (ii) the regulation of industries on account of growing air pollution in Delhi-NCR shall stand transferred to the appropriate suo moto case referred to in the subsequent order to be passed in Writ Petition (C) No. 13029/1985;

(d) The IAs which fall within the categories referred to in Paragraph 18(ii) shall stand transferred to the respective Suo Moto Writ Petition; and

(e) The IAs which do not pertain to any specific issue referred to above shall be dismissed, with liberty to the aggrieved party to move an appropriate petition before the High Court or this Court.

20. Similarly, the learned Amici are requested to submit to the Registry a list of specific issues that have been taken cognisance of by this Court and require further consideration but cannot be linked to any particular Interlocutory Application. Such issues shall then be taken up in appropriate proceedings, as per the subject matter involved.

21. An exercise analogous to that contained in Paragraph 19 shall be taken with respect to the Appeals and Petitions, except Contempt Petitions, tagged with the instant Writ Petition. Accordingly, if they are required to be considered by this Court, they shall be registered as IAs within the respective Suo Moto Writ Petition. In that respect, all tagged Contempt Petitions shall be separately listed after taking directions from the Chief Justice of India on the administrative side.

22. We request the Chief Justice of the Delhi High Court to register a suo moto case and constitute/appoint an appropriate bench to hear the IAs transferred to the High Court. We clarify that the adjudication by the High Courts shall be in exercise of the jurisdiction conferred under Article 226 of the Constitution.

23. The Registry shall list the newly registered Suo Moto Writ Petitions after seeking directions from the Chief Justice of India on the administrative side.

24. It is made clear that the disposal of the instant Writ Petition does not render this Court's previous orders and directions, issued from time to time, without any force. Such directions are final and continue to remain operative, subject to such further orders, modifications, or clarifications as may be issued in future proceedings. If, due to such previous directions, leave of this Court is required by a party, such party shall be at liberty to approach this Court through a fresh Writ Petition, giving all necessary particulars.

25. Keeping in view the diversity of issues that would be considered by this Court in the new suo moto cases, it would be prudent not to lay down any specific guidelines at this stage. However, the Amici shall prepare a short note, indicating steps that may be taken to procedurally inculcate timeliness and reduce formal minutiae in the proceedings. That would, thus, be considered

when the respective Suo Moto Writ Petition is taken for hearing by this Court.

26. Ordered accordingly.

27. As these proceedings conclude, we consider it fitting to acknowledge and appreciate the significant contributions of the learned counsel and the parties appearing in person, especially Shri M.C. Mehta and the learned Amici Curiae. Their unwavering dedication to the causes espoused in these proceedings has been instrumental in this Court's endeavours to protect the natural resources in Delhi and the surrounding areas. It is our sincere hope that the momentum generated in the instant Writ Petition will sustain and inspire a renewed resolve to advance these vital objectives systematically and efficiently.