

VPH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION No. 21 OF 2015  
IN  
WRIT PETITION No. 2524 OF 2013

Sanjay Tanaji Gurav ... Petitioner  
Vs.  
Municipal Corporation of Mumbai  
and Ors. ... Respondents

\*\*\*

Ms. Nisha Mehra, for the Petitioner.

Ms. Surekha Sonawane, for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2.

Mr. S. P. Srivastava, for Respondent No. 3.

\*\*\*

CORAM : V. M. KANADE, &  
REVATI MOHITE DERE, JJ.

DATE : NOVEMBER 26, 2015

PC.

1. It appears that by the impugned order, the writ petition was dismissed by observing that grievance of the Petitioner has been satisfied by virtue of an order passed by the Apex Court. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submits that Petitioner was not present when the order was passed. It is submitted that the Petitioner would like to bring on record certain facts to show that grievance of the Petitioner is different from the directions given by the

Apex Court.

2. In our view, since the Petitioner was not present when the matter was heard by this Court, for the reasons stated in paragraph 3 and 4 of the review petition, the impugned order is recalled and the writ petition is restored to the file. Review petition is accordingly allowed and disposed of in terms of prayer clause (a).

Sd/-  
[REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.]

Sd/-  
[V. M. KANADE, J.]

Vinayak Halemath