

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.6299 OF 2015

Office Notes, Office
memorandum of Coram,
appearances, Court's
orders or directions &
Registrar's orders.

Court's or
Judge's orders.

Shri Dinesh Kadam for the Petitioner.
Shri Manish Pabale, AGP for the Respondent No.5.

—

CORAM : A.S. OKA & A.K. MENON, JJ
DATED : 14TH SEPTEMBER 2016

P.C.:

. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner. The prayer clause (b) is the first substantive prayer sought in this Petition, which reads thus:

“(b) This Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct the Respondent No.5 to register First Information Report for the Offences under the provisions of the Public Records Act, 2005 as well as under relevant law against the Respondent No.3 and other concerned Officers/Employees/Persons who are responsible for the mis-placing or destroying of the information/documents

pertaining to the eligibility of the slum dwellers the Said SRA Scheme i.e. on the Plot Area situated at CTS No.159, 149/1 & 160A/1, Village-Majas, Andheri (E), Mumbai – 400 060.”

2. Admittedly, the Petitioner is not concerned in any manner with the property described in prayer clause (b) or the proposed slum redevelopment scheme on the said property. The prayer clause (c) relates to the Application dated 8th March 2013 in respect of the very property. The only contention raised by the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner is that the Petitioner is a maternal uncle of an affected person.

3. Admittedly, the Petitioner has no locus in respect of the property subject matter of the Application dated 8th March 2013. The prayer clauses (a) and (b) are consequential prayers based on the said Application.

4. Hence, at the instance of the Petitioner, the Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot be entertained. The Petition is dismissed only on the ground that the Petitioner has no locus.