

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

FIRST APPEAL NO. 506 OF 2016

IN

L.C. SUIT NO. 4693 OF 2006

M.C.G.M.

...Appellant

V/s.

Mr. Shaad S. Randhawa

....Respondent

* * * * *

Mr. Mohit Jadhav a/w. Mrs. M.R. Bhoir, Advocate for BMC, appellant.

Mr. Suresh M. Jadhav, Advocate for the respondent.

Coram :- Smt. R.P. SondurBaldota, J.

27th April, 2016.

P.C. :-

1). Admit.

(SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1220 OF 2016

IN

FIRST APPEAL NO. 506 OF 2016

IN

L.C. SUIT NO. 4693 OF 2006

M.C.G.M.

V/s.

Mr. Shaad S. Randhawa

...Applicant

....Respondent

* * * * *

Mr. Mohit Jadhav a/w. Mrs. M.R. Bhoir, Advocate for BMC, applicant.

Mr. Suresh M. Jadhav, Advocate for the respondent.

Coram :- Smt. R.P. SondurBaldota, J.

27th April, 2016.

P.C. :-

1). Mr. Jadhav, the learned Advocate appearing for the applicant points out that, the permission of reconstruction granted to the respondent under the order impugned in the appeal does not correspond with the structures described in the schedule to the notice issued under Section 56(3)(b) under the Maharashtra Regional Town Planning Act, impugned in the suit. The permission therefore is apparently beyond the scope of the suit. Hence, the Civil Application is allowed in terms of prayer clause (b).

(SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J)