

VPH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION No. 5439 OF 2016

Mr. Shankar R. Shetty & Ors. ... Petitioners  
Vs.  
The Town Planning Officer (NMMC)  
and Ors. ... Respondents

\*\*\*

Mr. Anil Sakhare, Sr. Counsel a/w Shilpangaonkar, Sunil Lahane,  
Rohan Mahadik, Neeta Verghese i/b The Juris Partners, for the  
Petitioners.

Mr. Sandeep V. Marne, for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

\*\*\*

CORAM : V. M. KANADE, &  
M. S. KARNIK, JJ.

DATE : MAY 5, 2016

PC.

1. The Petitioners were served with notice, issued under Section 53(3) of the MRTP Act, asking them to demolish the unauthorised amalgamation of two shops and other changes, which were made by them. Learned senior counsel Mr. Sakhare appearing for the Petitioners submits that the Petitioners did not make any representation since the relevant documents were not available. He

submits that the Petitioners propose to make a representation for regularisation of their structures, and the Respondents be directed to decide the said representation expeditiously, and till that time the Respondents be directed not to take any steps pursuant to the impugned notice.

2. This being the only relief claimed by the Petitioners, petition can be conveniently disposed of by directing them to make the representation for regularisation of their structures to the Respondents within three weeks, and the Respondents shall decide the same, on merits and in accordance with law, within two weeks thereafter. Till that time, no coercive steps shall be taken pursuant to the impugned notice.

Sd/-  
[M. S. KARNIK, J.]

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

yak Halemath