

pmw

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION NO.19 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.7458 OF 2012**

Smt. Uma Bhimsen Dua	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Pimpri Chinchwas New Town Development Authority & Ors.	... Respondents

Mr. S.G. Kudle, for the Petitioner.
Mr. Vijay D. Patil, for the Respondent No.1.
Mr. S.N. Patil, AGP, for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM : A.S. OKA &
S.C. GUPTE, JJ.**

**DATE : 2nd MARCH, 2015
(In Chamber at 2.35 pm)**

PC.

. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the Review Petitioner. He submits that the order of the State Government not to grant approval to the proposal of the first Respondent to regularise illegal structures in the city was never placed before this Court in the form of an affidavit. He relies upon the newspaper cutting of 4th September, 2013.

2. Paragraph 5 of the order dated 23rd December, 2013 of which review is sought reads thus :-

“5. As a submission was made that the decision reflected

from letter dated 28th March 2013 is not by the Hon'ble the Chief Minister, we had called upon the learned AGP to produce the original file. We have perused the file and relevant documents therein. We find that the proposal of the first respondent was processed at different levels and ultimately, Hon'ble the Chief Minister has approved the decision not to grant approval to the proposal of the first respondent. Communication issued by the Desk Officer records the decision of the State Government and therefore, there is no merit in the contention that the Hon'ble the Chief Minister is not a party of the said decision.”

3. The order of this Court is based on perusal of the original file and perusal of the decision of the Hon'ble the Chief Minister which is recorded therein.

4. Hence, there is no error on the face of the record. Even otherwise there is no ground for review. The Review Petition is rejected. The learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner seeks continuation of the protection granted in terms of paragraph 8 of the order dated 23rd December, 2013. The said prayer is opposed by the learned counsel appearing for the first Respondent. Only by way of indulgence, we direct that the protection granted under Clause 8 of the order dated 23rd December, 2013 will continue to operate for a period of one month from today.

(S.C. GUPTE, J)

(A.S.OKA, J)