

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 929 OF 2014

1. Anil Jayram Patil,
Age: 42 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 200 old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Jagdishprasad Shrinivas Gilda,
Age: 48 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Sanjay Nemichand Jain,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
4. Nemichand Hiralal Jain,
Age: 75 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
5. Sau. Sonali Bapurao Salunke,
Age: 35 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
6. Manilal Mangilal Parekh,
Age: 42 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
7. Avinash Madhukar Kolhe,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
8. Sau. Kiran Prakash Tekawade,
Age: 49 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

9. Dilip Baburao Kate,
Age: 51 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
10. Shailendrakumar Ramkisan Sonawane,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
11. Javhar Natvarlal Jony,
Age: 52 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
12. Rajendrakumar Ramkisan Sonwane,
Age: 48 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Jalgaon,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
through Department of Urban
Development, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32.
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon.
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon.
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon.

... Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 943 OF 2014

1. Shashikant Pundlik Shimpi,
Age: 32 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 35/36-A, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Rajmal Nandlal Zavar
since deceased through L.R.
Jagdish Rajmal Zavar,
Age: 51 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 225, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ... Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 547 OF 2015

1. Arun Shivilal Lohar,
Age: 55 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 18, Bhoite Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Krushnadas Shivilal Lohar,
Age: 53 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 19, Bhoite Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 944 OF 2014

1. Hiranand Khanumal Balani,
Age: 52 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 33, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Mandakini Madhukar Mahajan,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 88, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Vasant Ramchandra Wani,
Age: 71 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.168, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
4. Parmeshwar Sadanand Visrani,
Age: 35 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 80, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

5. Mahavir Dhanran Raka,
Age: 44 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 145, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ... Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 945 OF 2014

1. Jayantilal Motilal Zavar,
Age: 62 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 237, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Subhashchand Biharimal Agrawal,
Age: 48 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 237, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Rajkumar Bhishanlal Parpiyani,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.45, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 946 OF 2014

1. Nita Lalit Thakkar,
Age: 48 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 223, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Jivanmal Bansilal Lakhotiya,
Age: 65 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 241, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 947 OF 2014

Ghanshyam Gambhirmal Parpiyani,
Age: 66 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.44, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

... Petitioner

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 948 OF 2014

1. Robin Dayanand Katariya,
Age: 28 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 165, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Rajesh Padmakar Wani,
Age: 38 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 236, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Papesh Padmakar Wani,,
Age: 36 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.236, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

4. Damu Motiral Patil
since deceased through L. Rs.
Ravindra Damu Patil,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 170, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ... Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 949 OF 2014

1. Purushottam Natthu Wani,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 112, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Anant Natthu Wani,
Age: 40 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 112, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 950 OF 2014

1. Shishupal Shamlal Kingrani,
Age: 40 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 80, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
(Name of Shishupal is inadvertently
types as Shishpal in the impugned
Judgment & order dated 30.12.2013)
2. Pawankumar Mohanchand Agrawal,
Age: 30 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 153, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Sandip Dayanand Katariya,
Age: 32 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 131, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
4. Sumanbai Hiranman Patil,
Age: 55 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 57, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 951 OF 2014

Dropadabai Namdeo Mali,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business
R/o. Shop No. 111, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
(In the impugned judgment & Order
dated 30.12.2013 Name of Dropadabai
is inadvertently types as Dhrupadabai) ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 952 OF 2014

1. Arvind Sadanand Visrani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.79, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

2. Jayabai Keshav Marathe
Age 60 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.108, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
 3. Sunil Ashokkumar Parpyani,
Age 39 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.143, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
 4. Sanjay Ashokkumar Parpyani,
Age 35 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.143, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
- ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 953 OF 2014

Chandrakant Shridhar Jain,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.53, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

... Petitioner

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 954 OF 2014

1. Hiranman Gangadhar Patil,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.65, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
2. Kishor Ramkrushna Pate,
Age 48 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.66, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
3. Lalchand Dayaram Udasi,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.132, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon ..Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 955 OF 2014

Sureshchand Manakchand Chhajer,
Age 73 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.179, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

... Petitioner

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
- ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 956 OF 2014

1. Purushottam Dattatray Baviskar,
Age 65 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.235, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
2. Mohan Sadharam Karamchandani,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.235, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

3. Lakhichand Nandlal Zawar,
Age 80 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.233, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 957 OF 2014

Dnyanesh Shantilal Bhadade,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.187, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon ... Petitioner

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 958 OF 2014

1. Gokuldas Paromal Haswani,
Age 75 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.211, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
 2. Surjadevi Dhanraj Raka,
since deceased, through her L.R.
Mahavir Dhanraj Raka,
Age 44 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.145, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
- ...Respondents+

Mr P. S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 959 OF 2014

1. Dilip Bhagwan Mali,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.70, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

2. Mukesh Gurumal Pirwani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.56, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Ramprakash Kewalram Chawla,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.136, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Nawalkumar Nekumal Bhagwani
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.123, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Vasudeo Hakumatrai Jadhvani,
Age 43 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.94, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Kailash Bhikchand Mandwani,
Age 46 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.110, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Shankar Chandrabhan Tejawani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.91, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Shankar Chandrabhand Tejawani
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.92, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

9. Jaywani Vijaykumar Parpyani
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.38, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Khemchand Devdenomal Wallecha
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.95, Groud floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Isarram Tilokram Jat,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.47, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Baharumal Anandmal Meghani,
Age 78 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.115, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
13. Hemraj Chandumal Khatri,
Age 68 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.87, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
14. Umeshkumar Nawalkumar Bhagwani
Age 37 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.221, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 960 OF 2014

1. Rajesh Ashok kumar Tejawani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.201, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
2. Rameshlal Nenumal Bajaj,
Age 51 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.205, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
3. Prakash Bhila Wani,
Age 55 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.127, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
4. Sau. Priya Ashok Bajaj,
Age 30 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.31, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

5. Nandlal Dalumal Hemnani,
Age 72 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.71, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
6. Ramchand Tulsiram Kukreja,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.32, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
7. Ghanshyam Premchand Bhagwani,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.230, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
8. Kanta Pawankumar Meghwani,
Age 42 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.82, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
9. Sunil Hakumatrai Jadwani,
Age 37 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.95, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
10. Prushottam Chetumal Parpyani,
Age 38 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.31, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

11. Gopal Rajkumar Visrani,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.91, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
12. Mukesh Rijuram Matani,
Age 48 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.107, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
13. Ujwala Surendra Jain,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.42, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
14. Ujwala Surendra Jain,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.43, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 961 OF 2014

1. Sanjay Ashokkumar Lalwani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.67, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
2. Kamalkumar Avatram Panjabi,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.124, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
3. Jayprakash Khairajram Godwani,
Age 38 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.99, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
4. Girish Khirajram Godwani,
Age 31 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.100, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
5. Rajesh Tejumal Makdiya,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.172, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

6. Mohan Hiranand Khanchandani,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business
R/o Shop No.162, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
7. Ashok Gopichand Tejawani,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.209, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
8. Ashok Sadoromal Lalwani,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.35/36-C, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
9. Ramesh Bhagwan Popali,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.18, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
10. Dilip Biharimal Dingana,
Age 46 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.21, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
11. Shashtrilal Askaran Jain,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.89, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

12. Nanaik Manoharlal Raolani,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.67, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
13. Nandlal Gyanchand Katariya,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.217, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
14. Bharat Tekchand Shimpi,
Age 56 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.191, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
15. Dilip Govind Shinkar,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.157, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Phule Central
Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3 & 4

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 962 OF 2014

1. Jaywantibai Vijaykumar Parpyani,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.39, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
2. Sunil Ajitkumar Butwani,
Age 39 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.116, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
3. Mayabai Tejumal Makdiya,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.29, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
4. Kisandas Bodlomal Walbhani,
Age 73 years, Occu. Business
R/o Shop No.142, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
5. Vishal Bhagwandas Visrani,
Age 30 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.78, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

6. Fida Husain Fakruddin Bohari,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.58, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
7. Kailas Bhikchand Mandwani,
Age 46 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.111, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
8. Mukesh Ghanshyamdas Jadhawani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.126 & 127, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
9. Mahindrasingh Bhimsingh Rajput,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.113, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
10. Rupchand Kagumal Jiwani
since deceased through L.R.
Kashibai Rupchand Jiwani

Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.186, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon
11. Shrichand Ghanshyamdas Aadwani
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.109, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

12. Late Shankar Shyamlal Nathani,
through his legal heir
Sangita Shankar Nathani
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.114, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

13. Nankchand Gangaram Jadhvani
Age 70 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.66, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon,
Taluka and District Jalgaon

.. Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3 & 4

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 963 OF 2014

1. Sahebrao Namdeorao Sonawane,
Age: 49 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 50, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

2. Nandkishor Laxminarayan Mungad,
Age: 51 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.140, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Smt.Vimal Atmaram Wani,
Age: 70 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 129, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
4. Sharad Namdeorao Sonawane,
Age: 40 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 41, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
5. Najmuddin Fehrudin Ghadiyali,
Age: 48 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 128, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
6. Jayantkumar Kanakmalji Sanghavi
Age: 38 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 177, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

.. Petitioners

versus

1. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
2. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 964 OF 2014

1. Pradeepkumar Surendranath Jain,
Age: 53 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 97, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
2. Ambadas Balkrushna Wani
Age: 47 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.93, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Ramesh Rishuram Matani,
Age: 42 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 108, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
4. Pradeepkumar Surendranath Jain,
Age: 53 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.98, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
5. Manohar Jyoturam Rabwani,
Age: 50 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.68, Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Dist. Jalgaon.
6. Ramprakash Kewalram Chawala
Age: 49 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No. 136, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Dist. Jalgaon.

7. Pradeepkumar Surendra Jain
Age: 53 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.105, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Dist. Jalgaon.
8. Pradeepkumar Surendra Jain
Age: 49 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.106, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Dist. Jalgaon.
9. Ramesh Gangaram Talreja,
Age: 45 years, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.141, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba
Phule Central Market, Jalgaon.
Dist. Jalgaon.

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. B. Talekar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr P. R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1141 OF 2014

1. Ashwin Pranlal Jain,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.212, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Govind Ganpatrao Sable,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.175, Gr.Floor,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Dayalal Virjibhai Patel,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.38 & 39, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Rajendra Dhansingh Patil
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.157, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Bhagwant Suklal Mistry,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.44, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Rajesh Pannalal Jain
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.6 and 70, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Sau.Anita Dilip Kate
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.21, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Ramesh Ramdas Narkhede,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.137 & 138, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

9. Sunita Maheshkumar Mandhan,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.205, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

10. Dilipkumar Sevaram Mandhan,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.169, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

..Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1142 OF 2014

1. Digambar s/o Gopal Kulkarni,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.105, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

2. Sanjay s/o Jayram Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.69,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

3. Sunil s/o Ulhas Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.51, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Pravin s/o Damodhardas Rathi
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.182, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Late Rajendra Namdeo Choudhari,
since deceased, through his L.R.
Rahul Rajendra Choudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.48, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Dilip s/o Motilal Dahad,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.23, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Satish s/o Ramdas Pardeshi,
through Power of Attorney Holder
Rupesh s/o Ashok Pardeshi,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.129, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Dipak Agro Partnership Firm,
through power of attorney holder
Devendra s/o Pannalal Patel
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.96, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Sou.Pratibha Dnyaneshwar Choudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.30, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
10. Ashokkumar Aaildas Ahuja,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.47, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

11. Satyanarayan Ramnarayan Maniyar
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.59, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

12. Sundardas Mewaldas Lulla,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.45, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

..Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;

Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1143 OF 2014

1. Anil Dilip Bhandarkar,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.106, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

2. Sundardas Mewaldas Lulla,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.170,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

3. Uday Digambar Khande,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.100, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Sau.Usha Sharad Rathi,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.191, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Sharad Chatarbhuji Rathi,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.192, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Vishnu Santosh Nikumb,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.5, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Ravindra Santosh Nikumb
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.5, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Sarjodevi Pushkaraj Bang
through power of attorney holder
Jagdishprasad Shrinivas Gilda,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.202, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Nemichand Hiralal Jain,
through power of attorney holder,
Sanjay Nemichand Jain
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.143, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
10. Late Nandkishor Ganpatrao Sable
since deceased through his L.R.
Smt.Padmabai Nandkishor Sable,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.176, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

11. Kamal Tobacco Traders (Partnership firm)
through authorized Partnership
Smt.Pushpadevi Ramchandra Sharma,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.213, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

12. Rajendra Shrawan Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.73, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

..Petitioners

13. Pradeep Shrawan Patil
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.73, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

14. Pundlik Shamrao Patil
through power of attorney holder
Sanjay Ashokchandra Kabra
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.68, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1144 OF 2014

1. Dattatraya Shankarrao Vakure
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.195 & 194, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Pankajkumar Govindlal Parekh,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.172,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Sau.Sonal Jitendra Agrawal
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.66,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Makarand Purushottam Kulkarni,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.161,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Arun Tulshiram Attarde
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.81,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Sharad Ramdas Mahajan
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.174,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Sandip Baburao Zawar
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.36,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

8. Vijay Dullabh Patil
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.214,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Santosh Murlidhar Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.163,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
10. Laxmiben Khushaldas Patel
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.34,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
11. Sau.Pushpavati Kherajrai Godhwani
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.193,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
12. Vijay Nemichand Jain
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.167 & 168,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
13. Rajendra Dhansingh Patil
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.156,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

..Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1145 OF 2014

1. Sau. Sonal Sandip Shah,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No. 158, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Suresh Jagannath Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.64 & 132,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Harsh Anilkumar Jaju,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.118,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Prakash Shriram Agrawal,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No. 71,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Dhartidhan
Proprietary concern
Through: Harsh Anilkumar Jaju,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.120,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

6. Krishivaibhav
Partnership firm
Through its Authorized partner
Ravindra Rathi
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.19,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Shriram Kanhiyalal Agrawal
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.72,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Sanjay Hasmukhlal Shah
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.160,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Sandeep Hasmukhlal Shah,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.160,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
- 10 Sandip Nivruti Patil,
Age: Major, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.22, old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
11. Ramkrishna Hari Wani (Deceased)
Through his legal representative
and occupant:
Jagdish Ramkrishna Wani,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.177 & 178,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
12. Anup Dilip Bhandarkar,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.107,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

..Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon.
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon.
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1146 OF 2014

1. Tribhuvan Hiralal Shah,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No. 104, Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Prakash Ganpat Sable,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.173,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Sau. Sunita Maheshkumar Mandhan,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.204,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Yeswant Ramdas Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No. 76,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

5. Giridharlal Rameshwar Agrawal,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.130,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Sandip Hasmukhlal Shah,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.159,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
7. Yogesh Narayan Nehate,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.79,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Ashutosh Bhimsen Sethi,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.151 & 152,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Rahul Rupchand Khalse,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.139,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
10. Sandip Rupchand Khale,
Age: Major, Occ: Business,
R/o. Shop No.140, old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
11. Atul Vishwanath Mule,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.141 & 142,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

12. Sanjay Ashokchandra Kabra,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.67,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
13. Shailendra Sureshchanra Kabra,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.66,
Old B.J.Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon. ..Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon.
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon.
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1177 OF 2014

1. Harishkumar Motilal Chandwani,
Age 33 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.107, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Ashok Motilal Chandwani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.103, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

3. Late Kisanchand Mankchand Varyani,
Through his L.Rs.
Anilkumar Kishanchand Varyani,
Age 42 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.36, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Sumit Rajkumar Walecha,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.25, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Ashok Asandas Raisinghani,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.65, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Khemchand Devdinomal Walecha,
Age 42 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.95, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Rajendra Ghanshyamdas Matani,
Age 37 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.116, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Kishor Ramkrishna Pate,
Age 36 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.66, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Anilkumar Govindram Valwani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.123, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

10. Sakhawatrai Hukumatrai Valwani,
Age 47 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.117, Groud floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 11. Rajendrakumar Shivdinomal Mandwani,
Age 51 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.203, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 12. Rakesh Gyanchand Mandwani,
Age 39 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.62, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
 2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon
- ...Respondents

Mr A. R. Syed, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1762 OF 2014

1. Shaila Deepak Kochar,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Deepak Vedprakash Kochar,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Vijay Pandharinath Vibhandik,
Age 54 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Yuvraj Chandrakant Wagh,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Mahalaxmi Traders,
Through its Proprietor,
Shaikh Yasin Shaikh Wahab,
Age 43 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Kalabai Govind Bhamre,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Nana Tulshiram Pawar,
Age 53 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Pralhad Jayaji Avchar,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Usha Vinod Neve,
Age 42 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
Through its Commissioner
2. The Commissioner
Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon.
3. The Mayor,
The Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr Girish S. Rane, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1176 OF 2014

1. Laxmikant Bhagwan Rana,
Age 49 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.238, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Ghanshyam Mulchand Kukreja,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.176, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Harjitsing Karamsing Chhabada,
Age 67 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.60, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Manoharlal Amarlal Jadhawani for
Laxman Dhanrajmal Jadhawani,
Age 42 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.90, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

5. Amit Santosh Walecha,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business, and
Yogesh Santosh Walecha,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No. 120, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Manoj Bansilal Kawdiya,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business, and
Dilip Bansilal Kawdiya,
Age 43 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.151, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Gyaneshwar Shivdas Chaudhari,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.45, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Iswarlal Shivcharan Dhandore for
Sandip Shivcharan Dhandore,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.199, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Ramesh Shankar and Ashok Udhavdas Dharida,
Age Major, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.37/38C, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Bhanudas Chhotu Neve
Deceased thr. L.Rs.
Vinod Bhanudas Neve,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.60, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

11. Balkrishna Dal Besan Mill Prop.
Shymalal Amarlal Kriplani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
Chandrakant Amarlal Kriplani,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.46, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 12. Sk. Moin Al Haq,
Age 31 years, Occu. Business,
Mohd. Faruq Gulam Mohd.,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.52, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 13. Krishnakumar Sundardas Nathani,
Age 75 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.19, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
 2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon
- ...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1178 OF 2014

1. Vijay Shyamlal Kriplani,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.120, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Chetandas Waghmal Karda,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.234, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Suresh Dwarkadas Gehi,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.196, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Shankarlal Kodumal Thavrani for
Santosh Thavarani
Age 65 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.76, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Subhash Keshavlal Bhawsar,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No. 26, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Ghanshyam Giridharilal Lalwani,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No.212, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Sau. Laxmi Amarlal Talreja,
Age 47 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.55, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

8. Sunita Mohanlal Visrani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.190, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Manoj Gokul Sonawane,
Age 41 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.32, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Tikamlal Tulshiram Kukreja,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.46, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Shrichand Ghanshyamdas Adwani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.109, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Govindram @ Govindmal Bodhlumal Budhani,
Age 67 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.122, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
13. Sk. Mehmud Sk. Allabaksha,
Deceased thr. L.Rs.
Sk. Gulam Ahmed Sk. mehmud
Age 76 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.42, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
 4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents
- Mr A. R. Syed, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondent/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1179 OF 2014

1. Rajendrakumar Shivdinomal Mandwani,
Age 51 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.202, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Pratap Gyanchand Mandwani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.228, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Ashokkumar Gopichand Matani,
Age 60 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.232, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Gopichand Shevaram Thakur,
Age 51 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.47, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

5. Brijlal Gopaldas Ahuja,
Age 58 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No. 20, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Anil Tharumal Arya,
Age 41 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No.62, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Lalchand Shitaldas Talreja,
Age 74 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.49, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Pawan Kishor Bhagwani,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.227, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Mohd. Mustakim Haji Yusuf,
Age 43 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.99, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Gopichand Delomal Mayaramani,
Deceased thr. L.R.
Jagdish Gopichand Mayaramani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.73, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr A. R. Syed, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1180 OF 2014

1. Dilip Dadumal Mandhan,
Age 37 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.24, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Gangaram Nevadram Bhagwani,
Age 61 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.8, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Bhagchand Asarmal Rajpal,
Age 70 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.86, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Prabhulal Kisanchand Matani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.88, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

5. Jagdish Mulchand Kukrecha,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No. 175/181, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Sau. Indirabai Ashokkumar Matani,
Age 58 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No.74, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Umesh Atmaprakash Motiramani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.44, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Purushottam Mohanlal Daswani,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.51, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Kisanchand Totaldas Jewlani,
Age 63 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.78, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Manish Ghanshyamdas Jadhawani,
Age 34 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.13, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Ishwar Baharumal Meghani,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.34, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

12. Subhash Mulchand Kukrecha,
Age 52 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.180/188, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayor,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Jalgaon.
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ... Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1181 OF 2014

1. Nandlal Budhaldas Talreja,
Age 75 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.58, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Ramesh Premchand Bhagwani,
Age 53 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.229, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

3. Jayram Shamlal Katariya,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.43, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Ghansham Girdharilal Lalwani,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.212, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Gokul Vitthal Wani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No. 178, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Mukund Natthu Shimpi,
Age 57 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.52, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Rajesh Darshanlal Phawani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.163, Ground Floor
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Vinodkumar Sitaram Agrawal,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.193, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Laxmikant Bhagwan Rana,
Age 49 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.243, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

10. Sk. Abdulla Haji A. Sattar,
Age 52 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.152, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Sanjay Chadrabhan Tejawani,
Age 35 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.69, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Satish Tekchand Dingana,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.22, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
13. Dhanraj Kishanchand Chawala,
Age 43 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.97, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
14. Prakash Gangaram Bhawsar,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.23, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
15. Subhash Kisan Shimpi,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.231, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1182 OF 2014

1. Dilip Thakurdas Lalwani,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.102, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Nileshkumar Thakurdas Lalwani,
Age 36 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.122, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Bhanudas Namdeo Wani,
Age 71 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.104, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Thakurdas Jasumal Lalwani,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.103, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Omprakash Tarachand Nathani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No. 160, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

6. Sau. Rajkumari Ajitkumar Butwani,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.100, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Omprakash Parasmal Walecha,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.68, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Gurudas Parasmal Walecha,
Age 54 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.76, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Wandana Sitaram Deore,
Age 55 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.121, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Dilip Narayan Kolhe,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.30, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Sudhirschand Kundanlal Jain,
Age 57 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.117, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Shyamlal Manikchand Nathani,
Age 71 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.101, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

13. Murlidhar Bhila Wani,
Age 72 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.86, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

14. Murlidhar Bhila Wani,
Age 72 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.87, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon

4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1183 OF 2014

1. Styapal Kanhyyalal Parpiyani,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.183/184, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

2. Gitabai Nanakram Balani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business, and
Pratap Nanakram Balani,
Age 59 years, Occu. Business ,
R/o Shop No.72, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Suresh Lekhumal Kukreja,
Age 55 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.98, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Ramesh Dwarkadas Gehi,
Age 53 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.195, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Vishal Ashokkumar Mattani,
Age 35 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No. 154, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Dilipkumar Bhagatmal Rajpal,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.169, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Nanibai Pritamdas Bharti through
Vijaykumar Pritamdas Bharti,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.139, Ground Floor
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Sureshchandra Vishvanath Akole,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.85, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

9. Amar Ramchandra Kukreja for
Mukesh Ramchandra Kukreja,
Age 45 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.138, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Indirabai Jayramdas Ahuja,
Age 58 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.119, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Alka Bharat Shimpi,
Age 42 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.192, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1184 OF 2014

1. Sk. Haji Vajir Haji Yakub,
Age 80 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.39/40 A, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Premibai Ghanshyam Advani,
Age 58 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.125, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Nandlal Vishnumal Popli and
Harishkumar Vishnumal Popli,
Age 34 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.224, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Rajkumar Nandlal Hemnani,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.77, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Ravindrakumar Motilal Chandwani,
Age 34 years, Occu. Business, and
R/o Shop No. 106, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Rakesh Gyanchand Mandwani,
Age 39 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.61, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Sk. Usman Sk. Jamal Pinjari,
Deceased through L.R.
Hasinabee Sk. Usman,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.110, Ground Floor
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

8. Shyamlal Chetandas Kukreja for
Mukesh Ramchandra Kukreja,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.146, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Rameshlal Nenumal Bajaj,
Age 51 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.205, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Sunil Daulatram Gurunani,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.54, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Pushpabai Kisanchand Hemnani,
Deceased through L.R.
Sandip Brijlal Hemnani,
Age 32 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.64, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Shankarlal Jivandas Hanandi,
Age 64 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.94, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon

3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1185 OF 2014

1. Sk. Gulam Rasul Sk. Ramjan,
Deceased through L.R.
Saeed Gulam Rasul,
Age 45 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.37/38 A, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Radheshyam Kanhayylal Vyas,
Age 27 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.27, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Bansi Jagan Dabore,
Age 51 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.5, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Ramchandra Jasumal Lalwani,
Age 57 years, Occu. Business,
Jayashri Ramchandra Lalwani,
Age 52 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.242, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Ratanlal Prabhudas Tejawani,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No. 55, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

6. Harish Chandrakant Kriplani,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.119, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Bhagwandas Tejumal Visrani,
Age 36 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.77, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Usman Sk. Ramjan,
Age 73 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.83, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Sushilkumar Jaypaldas Talreja,
Age 42 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.79/118, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Sau. Sunita, Amit, Vidhya,
Yogesh Suryakant Rana,
Age Major, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.51, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Prakash Indralal Ahuja,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.210, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Vasant Shankar Wani,
Deceased through L.R.
Yogesh Vasant Wani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.149, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
 2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
 3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
 4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon
- ...Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1186 OF 2014

1. Dagdu Laxman Deore,
Deceased through L.R.
Girish Vijay Deore,
Age 31 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.7, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Murlidhar Namdeo Tejawani,
Age 47 years, Occu. Business, and
Sushilkumar Namdeo Tejawani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.3, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

3. Tejumal Shivalmal Makadiya,
Deceased through L.R.
Shankar Tejumal Makadiya,
Age 34 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.62, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Late Subhash Bhila Wani,
Deceased through L.R.
Ashish Subhash Wani,
Age 38 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.126, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Kalwati Kantilal Chordiya,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No. 197, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Shankar Baharumal Meghani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.114, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Pratap Rubchand Jiwani,
Age 45 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.185, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Hasmatrai Biharimal Dingana,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.135, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Isaram Tilokram Jat,
Age 49 Years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.48, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

10. Indrabai Prataprao Varyani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.50, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ... Respondents

Mr P. P. Chawan, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1754 OF 2014

1. Dnyaneshwar Bhaskar Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.180, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Ashok Ramkisan Kabra,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.65, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

3. Vinay Ravichandra Khatri,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.179, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 4. Vaibhav Pandurang Sarode,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.127, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 5. Vilas Devidas Chaudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.210, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 6. Dilip Gulabchand Sankhla,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.19 & 95, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 7. Brajesh Pannalal Jain,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.86, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 8. Nilesh Chandrakumar Chaudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.190 & 35, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 9. Rajiv Laxminarayan Jaju,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.108, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
 10. Digamber Gopal Kulkarni,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.31, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners
- versus
1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Department of
Urban Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

2. The Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1755 OF 2014

1. Eknath Kashinath Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.189, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Vishnu Santosh Nikumbh,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.85, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Dr. Balkrishna Sonu Nehete,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.77, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Department of
Urban Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon

3. Mayor, Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1756 OF 2014

1. Uttam Gulabchand Nyati,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.57, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Pandurang Hari Sarode,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.60, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Vikas Pandurang Sarode,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.128, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Vinod Premraj Totala,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.29, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
5. Umesh Dattatraya Patil,
Through G.P.A. Holder
Dilip Anant Patil,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.33, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
6. Vijay Prakash Pralhadiram Goyanka,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.52, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon

7. Sundardas Mewaldas Lulla,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.109 and 37, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
8. Ramesh Raghunath Wani,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.171, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
9. Goyanka Krishi Kendra (Partnership Firm)
Through its one partner
Vijayprakash Pralhadiram Goyanka,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.53, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
10. Chimandas Valiram
Through G.P.A. Holder
Mohan Totaram Chaudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.133 & 134, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
11. Vitthal Nathu Chaudhari,
(Deceased) through L.Rs.
Kishor Vitthal Chaudhari,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.181, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Department of
Urban Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon

4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1757 OF 2014

1. Rajesh Arun Choudhari,
Age 44 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.216, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
2. Vijay Girdharilal Chandak,
Age 51 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.148, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
3. Sau. Lata Arun Choudhari,
Age 62 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.215, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon
4. Shri. Arun Nathu Choudhari,
Age 67 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.147, Old B.J. Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Department of
Urban Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1763 OF 2014

1. Shila Suresh More,
Age 53 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 2. Pushpa Ashok Pande,
Age 47 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 3. Sadat Allabaksh Darbar Inayat,
Through Care Taker
Vasant Puna Vaidya,
Age 62 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
Through its Commissioner
 2. The Commissioner
Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon.
 3. The Mayor,
The Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon.
- ...Respondents

Mr Girish S. Rane, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1764 OF 2014

1. Ramkrishna Ratan Sonawane,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
2. Chandrakant Chudaman Bonde,
Through care taker,
Shailendra Narayanji Nagda,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
3. Vinod Trambak Neve,
Age 50 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
4. Ruchika Satyawar Rane,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
5. Satish Madhukar Mahajan,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
6. Swati Mahesh Lathi,
Age 40 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
7. Ratnakar Shivdas Khairnar,
Age 48 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
8. Manohar Ajabsingh Patil,
Through care taker,
Krishna Tulshiram Patil,
Age 41 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon

9. Rajendra Chandrashekhar Bhagwat,
Through his Care taker,
Shri. Sandeep P. Chaudhari,
Age 33 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon
10. Smita Uday Wagh,
Through care taker
Rajendara Bhaskar Lohar,
Age 42 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Market,
Jalgaon, Tq. & District Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
Through its Commissioner
2. The Commissioner
Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon.
3. The Mayor,
The Jalgaon City Municipal Corporation,
Jalgaon. ...Respondents

Mr Girish S. Rane, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State;
Mr Shrikant Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 2

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8081 OF 2014

1. Mrs. Raju Anil Kathuria,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.101, Mahatma
Jyotiba Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

2. Mrs. Sulochana Anandprakash Kathuria,
Age Major, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.102, Mahatma
Jyotiba Phule Central Market,
Jalgaon, District Jalgaon ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Department of Urban Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon.
3. Mayor, Jalgaon City
Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon
4. Commissioner, Jalgaon City Municipal
Corporation, Jalgaon ... Respondents

Mr S. B. Yawalkar, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 8146 OF 2014

1. Ramprakash Kewalram Chawala,
Age 49 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.137, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Nichaldas Holomal Lund,
Since deceased through L.R.
Vidhyabai Nachaldas Lund,
Age 78 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.56, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

3. Kanwarlal Amarchand Lodha,
Age 52 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.75, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Kabirdas Prabhumal Tejawani,
Since deceased through L.R.
Gurunamal Prabhumal Tejawani,
Age years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.30, Ground floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Ramdas Dayaram Zunzarrao,
Age 60 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.1, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Girdharilal Kavdamal Dingwani,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.182, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Sishpal Shyamlal Kingrani,
Age years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.80, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
8. Kisanchand Hukumchand Panjwani,
Since deceased through L.R.
Gurumukhdas Kisanchand Panjwani,
Age 52 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.48, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Bhishanlal Nanumal Walwani,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.85, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

10. Vidhyabai Liladhar Jadhawani,
Age 75 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.2, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 11. Kashinath Ramkrishna Wani,
Age 56 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.67, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
 12. Anil Tejumal Makdiya,
Age 36 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.171, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
- ... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
 2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of the
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
 3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
 4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon
- ...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 8147 OF 2014

1. Sudamchand Jashnamal Thakur,
Age 60 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.112, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
2. Mohan Asandas Raisinghani,
Age 50 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.28, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
3. Girshchandra Chotalal Pipriya,
Age 65 years, Occu.Business,
R/o Shop No.14, Low level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
4. Jitendra Madanlal Matani,
Age 30 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.11, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
5. Vijay Kisanchand Matani,
Age 42 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.10, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
6. Shakuntala Ramchandra Parpyani,
Age 55 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.69, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
7. Nawalkumar Nekumal Ghagwani,
Age 62 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.124, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

8. Arjun Vasumal Mandhan,
Age 48 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.109, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
9. Sk. Ibrahim Sk. Ismail Patwe,
Age 57 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.12, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
10. Hiralal Dindayal Mandhan,
Age 41 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.96, Low Level,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
11. Chandulal Narayan Rana,
Since deceased through L.R.
Laxmikant Bhagwan Rana,
Age 49 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.104, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
12. Amarlal Sadoromal Katpal,
Age 61 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.218, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
13. Pawan Totaram Jewlani,
Age 44 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.81, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon
14. Kanhyalal Ganumal Walecha,
Age 58 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Shop No.84, Ground Floor,
Mahatma Jyotiba Fule Central
Market, Jalgaon, District Jalgaon

... Petitioners

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The Mayer,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. The Commissioner,
Municipal Corporation of
City of Jalgaon
4. Municipal Corporation of City
of Jalgaon, Dist. Jalgaon ...Respondents

Mr S. P. Brahme, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr K. G. Patil, Addl. Govt. Pleader for respondents/State

CORAM : N.W. SAMBRE, J.

**(Date of reserving the
order : 15th April, 2015**

**Date of pronouncing the
order : 8th May, 2015)**

ORDER :

The present group of petitions is directed against the order passed by the Commissioner, Jalgaon Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon, i.e. respondent no.2 to the present petitions, thereby holding the present petitioners as trespassers and directing their eviction, in exercise of powers under section 81-B of the Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporations Act, 1949 (for short "Act") and the common judgment rendered by learned District Judge-1, Jalgaon, in appellate jurisdiction, in

exercise of powers under section 81 of the Act, thereby confirming the order passed by the Commissioner, in regard to the eviction of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners herein claim to be allottees of the occupancy rights for a period of twenty years in various markets maintained by the Jalgaon Municipal Corporation.

3. The occupancy rights as were conferred since had already come to an end, the petitioners were served with notice by the respondent – Municipal Corporation, in exercise of powers under section 81-B of the Act, intimating them that their term of occupancy has already expired and calling upon them as to why an order of eviction be not passed against them.

4. The petitioners replied the said notice. *Inter alia*, the petitioners questioned the locus of the respondent – Corporation to initiate the action of eviction and questioned the process, on following grounds amongst others :-

(a) That the respondent – Municipal Corporation is not absolute owner of the property;

- (b) The consideration of the shops in question has already been paid 20 years back;
- (c) A resolution is passed by the General Body meeting held on 5th January, 2012, thereby proposing the allotment of the shops in question on lease for 99 years to the petitioners. Subsequently, on 29th March, 2012, another resolution was passed granting extension of three years with 10% rise on the last rent paid;
- (d) The resolution dated 29th March, 2012 is still holding the field;
- (e) The notice is without jurisdiction, illegal, misconceived, frivolous, without authority of law, etc.

5. It is further claimed that by a resolution dated 5th January, 2012, which governs the eight shopping complex, the lease was ordered to be renewed for a period of 99 years by accepting premium at current market rate, based on ready reckoner method.

6. The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon, authorized its subordinate officers to hear the allottees pursuant to the show cause notice and reply. Accordingly, Mr Dhamne, Mr Pathan and Mr Behere,

consequent upon show cause notice and reply given thereto, heard the matter.

7. During the said hearing, it was brought to the notice that the State Government, under section 451 of the Act, has suspended resolution No.1231, dated 5th January, 2012 for leasing out shops for 99 years. The second resolution No.1275, dated 29th March, 2012, also came to be suspended.

8. In exercise of powers conferred under section 81-B of the Act, the respondent – Municipal Corporation, under the authority of Commissioner, passed an order declaring the petitioners as trespassers, as the period of occupancy as was permitted, had already come to an end.

9. Feeling aggrieved thereby, the petitioners preferred appeals in exercise of powers under section 81-A of the Act before the learned District Judge, Jalgaon, some time in October, 2012.

10. The appeals came to be dismissed by common judgment dated 30th December, 2013, passed by District Judge-1, Jalgaon. As such, present petitions.

11. While questioning both the orders, i.e. passed by the Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Jalgaon and the learned District Judge-1, Jalgaon, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners would urge that once the general body has passed a resolution in favour of the petitioners, extending lease for 99 years at ready reckoner rates, the suspension of the same by the State Government under section 451 and the pendency of the proceedings before the State Government thereof, should have taken as a restraint by the respondent – Corporation while passing order under section 81-B of the Act. It is further submitted that though the petitioners sought opportunity to lead evidence, no such opportunity was provided. It is further urged that the matter was heard by an officer on behalf of the Commissioner, whereas the final order is passed by the Commissioner. According to the learned Counsel, the same violates principles of natural justice as it amounts to denial of opportunity of hearing. He would further urge that the nature of powers which are exercised in the present case under section 81-B of the Act, are *quasi judicial* and in such cases, it is not open for the Commissioner to delegate *quasi judicial* powers to his subordinate officers, unless there is a specific provision to that effect in the statute book. According to the petitioners, the said act is contrary to the provisions of section 69 of the Act. Petitioners have sought to place reliance upon the judgment of the Apex Court in the matter of **Indian National Congress (I) vs. Institute of Social Welfare & ors.**, reported in **AIR 2002 SC 2158** and the judgment

of this Court in the matter of **Damodar Jairam Sao vs. Deputy Charity Commissioner, Nagpur & ors.**, reported in **2011 (6) Mh.L.J. 431**, with a view to urge that the delegation of *quasi judicial* powers is not permissible and what is permissible is delegation of administrative powers. The act of passing of an order of eviction by the Commissioner is *quasi judicial* in nature and as such contrary to the law laid down by this Court in the matter of **Ganeshrao Kisanrao Deshmukh vs. Devisingh Venkatsingh**, reported in **1972 Mh.L.J. 661** and **Ramchandra Jivatram Chetwani through power of attorney holder Mrs Poonam Deepak Amar vs. Pune Municipal Corporation & ors.**, reported in **2013 (1) Mh.L.J. 245**. He would further urge that the authority was duty bound to give personal hearing to each of the parties. He would further urge that even denial to examine the witness also amounts to denial of opportunity of hearing. It is also urged by the learned Counsel for the petitioners that in absence of Regulation as is provided under section 81-I of the Act, the powers exercised by the Commissioner, ordering eviction are un-guided and as such, are contrary and sought quashing of the same for want of appropriate Regulations. According to him, the order demonstrates the pre-judgment by the Commissioner and the show cause notice was an empty formality, as according to him, no separate notice *qua* damages was served, but the said issue was included in the first show cause notice without recording any satisfaction. According to him, no effective/meaningful hearing is granted and as such, the order passed by

the Commissioner suffers from non application of mind. It is further alleged that the order impugned is cyclostyled one and reflects fill in the blanks, which according to him, is contrary to law laid down by this Court in the matter of **Vidyaprasarak Samaj & anr. vs. State of Goa & ors.**, reported in **1992 (1) BCR 705**. In addition to above, learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that at some places even though the shop is from some other market, the reference in the order passed by the Commissioner is in relation to some other shop block. The above referred points are canvassed with a view to demonstrate denial of opportunity of hearing and non-application of mind.

12. While countering the above referred submissions, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent – Corporation submits that the Corporation is duty bound to transfer rights in relation to its property as per market rate and for that purpose sought support from the provisions of section 79-D of the Act. He would urge that admittedly, in all the cases, the period of occupancy was already over and the continuation is sought by the petitioners, by taking recourse to such steps which are contrary to the provisions of the Act. According to him, there is no equity in favour of the petitioners because of expiry of the time and in absence of any legal right in favour of the petitioners, this Court should not issue any writ. Learned Counsel for respondent – Corporation would further urge that the delegation is strictly in accordance with the provisions of section 69 of the

Act. According to him, the institutional hearing is a recognized concept and the Commissioner was right in passing an order as the same is permissible in law. He would further urge that the issues raised in the present petitions are no more *res integra* and sought support from the judgment dated 10th June, 2014, rendered by this Court in Writ Petition No.7977 of 2013 and companion petitions.

13. Learned Counsel would further urge that it is open for the present petitioners to participate in the process of allotment which should be taken afresh by the respondent - Municipal Corporation.

14. Upon considering the submissions made by the respective parties and upon considering the evidence in an analytical way, it is noted that this Court, while dealing with the similar contentions in Writ Petition No.7977 of 2013 and the scope of section 81-B, 68, 69 and 81-E of the Act, has observed that it was incumbent on the part of the petitioners to set out a case of prejudice, in case if the petitioners are not permitted to examine the witnesses or there was non-supply of appropriate documents. Similar case appears in the present matters. The petitioners have not demonstrated the prejudice because of refusal of permission to examine the witnesses and also in relation to the documents which are not supplied to them. At least, no such material is placed on record or no such prejudice is established when admittedly, the lawful period of occupancy in

favour of petitioners has come to an end in 2012 itself.

15. The contention as regards hearing to be given to each of the petitioners is concerned, the Court there dealt with the issue as regards institutional hearing and relied upon the judgment of the Apex Court, in the matter of **Kalinga Mining Corporation vs. Union of India & ors.**, reported in **(2013) 5 SCC 252** and considered the observations in paragraphs 70 and 71 of the said judgment, which read thus :-

“70. We also do not find much substance in the submission made by Mr. Krishnan that the order dated 27th September, 2001 is vitiated as it has been passed by an officer who did not give a hearing to the parties. This is clearly a case of an institutional hearing. The direction has been issued by the High Court for a hearing to be given by the Central Government. There was no direction that any particular officer or an authority was to give a hearing. In such circumstances, the orders are generally passed in the relevant files and may often be communicated by an officer other than the officer who gave the hearing.

71. The legality of institutional hearing has been accepted in England since the case of Local Government Board Vs. Arlidge (supra). The aforesaid judgment was quoted with approval by this Court in Pradyat Kumar Bose (supra). This Court approved the following passage from the speech of Lord Chancellor in the aforesaid case:

"My Lords, I concur in this view of the position of an administrative body to which the decision of a question in dispute between parties has been entrusted. The result of its enquiry must, as I have said, be taken, in the absence of directions in the statute to the contrary, to be intended to be reached by its ordinary procedure. In the case of the Local Government Board it is not doubtful what this procedure is. The Minister at the head of the Board is directly responsible to Parliament like other Ministers. He is responsible not only for what he himself does but for all that is done in his department. The volume of work entrusted to him is very great and he cannot do the great bulk of it himself. He is expected to obtain his materials vicariously through his officials, and he has discharged his duty if he sees that they obtain these materials for him properly. To try to extend his duty beyond this and to insist that he and other members of the Board should do everything personally would be to impair his efficiency. Unlike a Judge in a Court he is not only at liberty but is compelled to rely on the assistance of his staff."

In view of the aforesaid settled position of law, it is difficult to accept the submissions of Mr. Krishnan that the order dated 27th September, 2001 suffers from any legal or procedural infirmity. "

This Court, as such, infers that in the facts of the present case, wherein there are more than 1200 shop-keepers against whom the respondent – Corporation was required to proceed with, the Commissioner was right in taking recourse to the institutional hearing. Even otherwise, no prejudice to the petitioners in each case as regards denial of hearing is brought to

the notice of this Court. This Court has also taken into account the law laid down by the Apex Court in the matter of **Canara Bank vs. V.K. Awasthy**, reported in **(2005) SCC 321**, in which the Apex Court has considered the aspect as regards the prejudice to be demonstrated in case of denial of principles of natural justice. The observations in paragraph 16 of the said judgment read thus :-

"How then have the principles of natural justice been interpreted in the Courts and within what limits are they to be confined? Over the years by a process of judicial interpretation two rules have been evolved as representing the principles of natural justice in judicial process, including therein quasi-judicial and administrative process. They constitute the basic elements of a fair hearing, having their roots in the innate sense of man for fair-play and justice which is not the preserve of any particular race or country but is shared in common by all men. The first rule is 'nemo judex in causa sua' or 'nemo debet esse judex in propria causa sua' as stated in (1605) 12 Co.Rep.114 that is, 'no man shall be a judge in his own cause' Coke used the form 'aliquis non debet esse judex in propria causa quia non potest esse judex at pars. (Co.Litt. 1418), that is, 'no man ought to be a judge in his own case' because he cannot act as Judge and at the same time be a party' The form 'nemo potest esse simul actor et judex', that is, 'no one can be at once suitor and judge' is also at times used. The second rule is 'audi alteram partem', that is, 'hear the other side' At times and particularly in continental countries, the form 'audietur at altera pars' is used, meaning very much the same thing. A corollary has been deduced from the above two rules and particularly the audi alteram partem rule, namely 'qui aliquid statuerit parte

inaudita alteram actquam licet dixerit, haud acquum facerit' that is, 'he who shall decide anything without the other side having been heard, although he may have said what is right, will not have been what is right' (See Bosewell's case (1605) 6 Co.Rep. 48-b, 52-a) or in other words, as it is now expressed, 'justice should not only be done but should manifestly be seen to be done' Whenever an order is struck down as invalid being in violation of principles of natural justice, there is no final decision of the case and fresh proceedings are left upon. All that is done is to vacate the order assailed by virtue of its inherent defect, but the proceedings are not terminated."

The Court has also dealt with the issue as regards the opportunity of hearing to the petitioners given by a officer and the Commissioner passing the order, who in fact, were not heard by the Commissioner. The Court, in the light of section 81-E of the Act has observed that in absence of plea in regard to the compliance of section 81-E before the Commissioner, no prejudice was established by the petitioners before the Court.

16. The foremost contention of the petitioners that the nature of powers which are exercised by the Commissioner, are either judicial or *quasi judicial* and as such, such powers cannot be delegated for want of specific provision to that effect is concerned, it is required to be noted that this Court had an occasion to consider the said issue in the matter of **Ramchandra Jivatram Chetwani through power of attorney holder vs. Pune Municipal Corporation & ors.**, reported in **2013 (3) Bom. C.R.**

297. This Court, while dealing with the scheme of sections 68 and 69 of the Act, particularly in the matter of delegation of powers and while reasonably construing the provisions of section 68 of the Act, has observed in paragraphs no.6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 of the said judgment thus :-

“6] Section 69 follows section 68. Section 68 states that the Commissioner to exercise powers and perform duties of Corporation under other laws. Then comes section 69, which states that Municipal Officers may be empowered to exercise certain powers etc. of the Commissioner or Transport Manager. Therefore, subject to the provisions of sub-sections 2 and 3, any of the powers, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon or vested in the Commissioner or Transport Manager by or under any of the provisions of this Act may be exercised, performed or discharged under the Control of the Commissioner or Transport Manager as the case may be, by any Municipal Officer whom the Commissioner or Transport Manager generally or specifically empower by or any writing in this behalf.

7] It is not the contention of Mr.Deshmukh or Mr.Dani that there is no general delegation in favour of the authority or officer passing impugned orders. In this case, the orders have been passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Land Acquisition and Estate Management, of Pune Municipal Corporation. The argument is not that there is no delegation in his favour at the given or relevant time. The argument is that such delegation would not enable him to exercise powers under Chapter VIII -A of the Act as such powers are

quasi judicial in nature and they have to be specifically delegated. That provision finding no place under section 81(1), that the power to evict could not have been exercised by him.

8] It is not possible to accept this argument. In fact what the Supreme Court holds in the case of Bombay Municipal Corporation Vs. Dhondu Narayan Choudhary (A.I.R. 1965 S.C. 1486) would squarely apply in this case. In that decision, the Supreme Court was considering a challenge to the order of eviction from the Bombay Municipal Corporation premises. The proceedings were initiated by one of the officers to whom the powers of Commissioner were delegated in terms of general delegation flowing from section 68 which is more or less similarly worded as sub-section 1 of section 69 of the BPMC Act. The argument was that the orders have not been passed by the Commissioner. The judicial function of the Commissioner had been delegated under the Commissioner's control and subject to his revision. The City Civil Court (Appellate Authority) in that case, held that the officer who has passed the order was not properly invested with the jurisdiction and, therefore, his order was a nullity. The same contention as was raised by Mr.Deshmukh and supported by others was raised before the Supreme Court.

9] The Supreme Court reproduced section 68 and other sections and then held that sub-sections 1 and 2 of section 68 would refer to several provisions which include section 105B to E. Therefore, they cover delegation of judicial power. In para 3 of this decision, the Supreme Court held thus:-

"3. No question has been raised that any of the amendments is ultra vires so the words of section 68 must be reasonably construed. It goes without saying that judicial power cannot ordinarily be delegated unless the law expressly or by clear implication permits it. In the present case the amendment of section 68 by inclusion of delegation of the functions of the Commissioner under sections 105-B to 105-E does indicate the intention that the judicial or quasi judicial powers contained in Chapter 6-a were expressly intended to be delegated. The the delegation as such there can be no objection.

What is objected to is the provision, both in the section as well as in the order of delegation, that the exercise of the function is to be under "the Commissioner's control" and "subject to his revision". These words are really appropriate to a delegation of administrative functions where the control may be deeper than in judicial matters. In respect of judicial or quasi judicial functions these words cannot of course bear the meaning which they bear in the delegation of administrative functions. When the Commissioner stated that his functions were delegated subject to his control and revision it did not mean that he reserved to himself the right to intervene to impose his own decision upon his delegate. What those words meant was that the Commissioner could control the exercise administratively as to the kinds of cases in which the delegate could take action or the period or time during which the power might be exercised and so on and so forth. In other words, the administrative side of the delegate's duties were to be the subject of control and revision but not the essential power to decide whether to

take action or not in a particular case. This is also the intention of section 68 as interpreted in the context of the several delegated powers. This is apparent from the fact that the order of the delegate amounts to an order by the Commissioner and is appealable as such. If it were not so the appeal to the Bombay City Civil Court would be incompetent and the order could not be assailed. The order of the delegate was the order of the Commissioner and the control envisaged both in section 68 and the order of delegation was not control over the decision as such but over the administrative aspects of cases and their disposal. No allegation has been made that the Commissioner intervened in the decision of the case or improperly influenced it. In these circumstances the order impugned in the appeal cannot be sustained."

10] To my mind, it is not as if the Supreme Court has held that there has to be reference to the provisions, enabling the eviction from Municipal Premises, in the Authority to delegate or empowerment to exercise the powers of the Commissioner and general wording of sub-section 1 of section 69 in this case would be of no assistance. The Supreme Court has relied upon general power and the general or special empowerment by order in writing is the requirement and based on which any of the powers, duties or functions conferred or imposed or vested in the Commissioner may be exercised, performed or discharged under his control and subject to such conditions and limitations, if any, as may be prescribed by rules by any Municipal Officer, whom the Commissioner may specifically

or generally empower by an order in Writing in this behalf.

Therefore, far from assisting, the observations of the Supreme Court in para 3 of this decision, would militate against the submission that there has been no delegation in favour of Deputy Municipal Commissioner. He cannot be said to be usurper or a stranger to the Act or the authority envisaged thereby. He is no stranger to the Corporation but is very much an officer of the Corporation. If there is a general delegation by an order in writing empowering him to exercise the powers and that is not disputed, then, to my mind, the order passed by the Deputy Municipal Commissioner in this case cannot be faulted.

11] The District Judge committed no error in relying upon the wording of the provision in question and the judgement of the Supreme Court. The learned Judge has held that the Commissioner's powers can be delegated to other officers. If the Commissioner's powers have been delegated and which powers include a power to order eviction from the Municipal Premises, then, to my mind, the reasoning in the District Courts order cannot be faulted. The first contention, therefore, must fail.”

17. Once this Court has already taken a view in the above referred judgment, no contrary view of the Apex Court is brought to the notice of this Court, so as to dislodge the said judgment. The Court, while dealing with the scheme under section 69 of the Act has observed that the Deputy Municipal Commissioner or an officer of the Corporation, in whom the

powers are delegated, cannot be termed as usurper of the powers or a stranger to the Act. The Court has further proceeded to observe that if there is general delegation by an order in writing empowering the officer to exercise the powers and unless the same is disputed, then the order passed by such officer cannot be faulted.

18. In the factual background of the present case, it is required to be noted that the respondent – Commissioner has, in express terms, delegated the powers to the concerned officers, as is apparent from the orders issued by the Commissioner on 18th April, 2012 authorizing Sajid Pathan, Deputy Commissioner (General Administration), for conducting an inquiry and granting hearing in relation to the occupants from the old B.J. market; Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar market; Bhoite market, Mr Bhalchandra Behere, Deputy Commissioner (Revenue), in relation to Mahatma Phule market, Ramlal Chobe market and Mr Dhamne, Joint Director (Town Planning) for Central Phule market. While ordering delegation, the Commissioner was alive to the fact about coming to an end the occupancy rights of the petitioners/occupants on 31st March, 2012, the Commissioner as such, directed the said officers to conduct an hearing in the matter and submit their reports. The respective officers, named above, admittedly have conducted the hearing in the matter, pursuant to the notice issued by the Commissioner. The Commissioner, while ordering the eviction of the petitioners under section 81-B of the Act has taken into account the above

factual background, the explanation tendered by the petitioners/occupants to the notice, the opportunity given to the petitioners pursuant to the general body resolution No.1231 on 5th January, 2012, not honouring the said offer by the petitioners and the hearing given to the petitioners through the Advocate. The Commissioner then inferred that the petitioners have failed to explain their possession to be lawful and as such, declared them trespassers and ordered their eviction.

19. The order of the Commissioner also contains the penalty/damages.

20. The petitioners, feeling aggrieved thereby, preferred appeals before the District Judge, Jalgaon and the learned District Judge has passed common judgment dated 2nd January, 2014, dismissing the appeals. The learned District Judge, while dealing with the appeals, has considered the grounds raised before him. The District Judge also considered the issue, whether the possession of the petitioners over shops in question is legal and proceeded to pass an order dismissing the appeals after considering the points formulated for determination.

21. The important aspect of the matter, as regards the burden on the petitioners to prove that their possession was lawful after expiry of twenty years occupancy period, was not at all discharged by them. The eventualities to that effect taken note of and discussed in the judgment of

this Court in the matter of Ramchandra Jivatram Chetwani through power of attorney holder Mrs Poonam Deepak Amar (cited supra) are worth relying upon. This Court, in paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 of the said judgment, has observed thus :-

“12] Equally, there is no merit in the contention that the petitioners cannot be evicted once they were ready and willing to pay the amounts of rent or compensation charged by the Municipal Corporation in relation to the Municipal Premises. The argument is that the Corporation in fact performs a social duty in allotting shop premises to needy persons like the petitioners and, therefore, even if the initial period comes to an end as long as the petitioners are ready and willing to pay the amount and have offered the same for continuation in the premises, then, that would not mean that they are unauthorized occupants.

13] This argument is only stated to be rejected because in all cases what has been found as a fact by the authorities is that the Municipal Premises were allotted for a specific period to all the allottees like the petitioners. That period has come to an end. There is no renewal of the term. In such circumstances, each of the premises being located in prime locality and having tremendous market value are sought to be disposed of by the Corporation by inviting bids from the public. There is no question of the petitioners, then continuing and once their authority to occupy and use the same having come to an end. None of the petitioners could produce any documents which would enable them to urge that their offer or payment made is stated to be in terms of the lease or the initial authority to occupy and, therefore, the

premises are continued in their possession and occupation as an allottee or lessee, claiming through the Corporation. In fact in the case of Ramchandra Chetwani, the allegation is that the lease period has expired. The authority has come to an end. The person is in occupation without any authority from 1st April 1994 and such prolonged occupation was termed as unauthorized and illegal and sought to be put an end to. To my mind, once the allotments have been made for a specific period and the period has come to an end, then, even if some sporadic payments have been made and accepted is no ground to hold that the occupation is authorized and not unauthorized as claimed by the Corporation. The table or chart which has been set out in para 14 of the order of the learned Judge would indicate as to how each of the occupant was inducted way back in the premises but their authority to occupy the same has come to an end either in 1994 or 2004. There is no question of renewal in their favour. In these circumstances, it is no good contending that the premises are lawfully occupied and possessed by the petitioners.

14] Lastly, a faint attempt is made by urging that the order is passed not in terms of sections 81-B but in terms of the Rules which are framed in 2008 and which are under challenge in this Court. The order read completely and properly would indicate that it is in terms of the powers to evict persons from Corporation premises under section 81-B, that it has been passed. The reference to rules has been made only with a view to show that even after the period has come to an end and has expired by efflux of time, none of the persons in occupation have in terms of the 2008 rules sought lease in

their favour and such lease has not been granted in terms of the rules. It is only to buttress and support the conclusion that the premises are in unauthorized use and occupation that the reference is made to the Rules. Beyond that it cannot be said that Rules are the source of power and not section 81-B.”

22. In view thereof, in my opinion, the possession as is sought to be established by the petitioners to be lawful, is contrary to the record and the evidence sought to be relied upon by them.

23. In my opinion, the case of the petitioners is squarely covered by the judgment in the matter of Ramchandra Jivatram Chetwani through power of attorney holder Mrs Poonam Deepak Amar (cited supra) and the judgment rendered by the learned Single Judge of this Court in Writ Petition No.7977 of 2013.

24. Once it is held that there are express powers in the statute to delegate and said powers are exercised by the authority in lawful manner, it is required to be noted that the aspect of institutional hearing is rightly taken recourse to, in the light of the judgment of the Apex Court (cited supra), when more than 1200 shop owners are sought to be evicted. The observations of this Court on the said issue, particularly in the background of the law laid down by the Apex Court, in the matter of Kalinga Mining Corporation, Canara Bank (cited supra) and **C. Albert Morris vs. K.**

Chandrasekaran & ors., reported in **(2006) 1 SCC 228**, are worth relying upon.

25. Apart from above, denial to give an opportunity of hearing or non-supply of documents, has not been established before this Court, so as to demonstrate any prejudice to the petitioners. Apart from above, it is required to be noted that the contention, that the proceedings under section 451 are pending before the State Government is of hardly any assistance to the petitioners as the order which is under consideration before the State Government was never sought to be relied upon by the petitioners so as to protect their possession and it is used as a tool in the present case to raise a ground to protract the proceedings.

26. In the light of above, in my opinion, no case for interference on merits is made out, particularly in relation to the order of eviction.

27. So far as the issue as regards levy of damages against the petitioners is concerned, once it is established that the possession of the petitioners over the premises is unlawful, in my opinion, the authority was right in proceeding against them.

28. In the light of the foregoing reasons, the writ petitions fail and stand dismissed with no order as to costs.

(N.W. SAMBRE, J.)

29. At this stage, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners pray for continuation of present arrangement for possession of the petitioners over the shops in question for a period of four weeks, which is not objected. Thus, the present arrangement for possession of the petitioners, over the shops in question, is continued for a period of four weeks from today.

(N.W. SAMBRE, J.)

amj