

Shephali

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2645 OF 2014

Hiya Tarun Raheja Nee Sapna Kishore Narang ...Petitioner
Versus
The State of Maharashtra & 6 Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Vivek Singh i/b M/s. ARM Legal and Sharad Ravi for the
Petitioner.
Mr. Vinod Mahadik for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

CORAM: A. S. OKA & G.S. PATEL, JJ.
DATED: 8th December 2015

PC:-

1. Time is sought on behalf of the Petitioner on the ground that the Advocate for the Petitioner is not available. On the same ground, time was sought on the last date.

2. We have perused the only substantive prayer in this Petition, which is prayer clause (a). It is a prayer for interim relief till the disposal of L. C. Suit No. 445 of 2014 filed by the Petitioner, which is stated to be pending in the City Civil Court at Mumbai. Such a relief cannot be granted in a Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. We, accordingly, reject the Petition. However, all the remedies of the Petitioner are kept open. All contentions of the Petitioner are kept open.

(G. S. PATEL, J.)

(A. S. OKA, J.)