

ssp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
NOTICE OF MOTION NO.117 OF 2016 IN
REVIEW PETITION (L)NO.61 OF 2015 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1751 OF 2015

Rittesh Kumar Popatlal Chheda ...Applicant
vs.
Municipal Corporation of
Greater Mumbai & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.Shivraj Kunchge i/b Ms Anjali Awasthi for the
applicant
None for the respondent

CORAM : A.S.OKA, &
K.R.SHRIRAM,JJ.
DATE : MAY 2, 2016

P.C.:

1 Though the Review Petition and the Notice of Motion are fixed on board on the basis of praecie filed by the review petitioner and though the board was notified on last Friday, time is sought on behalf of the petitioner.

2 We have perused the order dated 25th August 2015 which is sought to be reviewed. In the main writ petition filed by the review petitioner, there was only one prayer. The first part of the prayer is for a declaration that the letter dated 11th April 2014 issued by the Mumbai Municipal Corporation was not in compliance with the Judgment dated 10th March 2014 passed by the another Division Bench in Writ Petition No.634 of 2013. The second part of the

prayer is for directing the Assistant Commissioner of the Municipal Corporation to decide the representation dated 18th March 2014. The order dated 25th August 2015 which is sought to be reviewed issues a direction to the Mumbai Municipal Corporation to pass an order on the pending proposal within a period of one month. The issue of legality and validity of the communication dated 11th April 2014 is specifically kept open and a liberty is granted to the review petitioner to agitate the issue of legality and validity of the said communication if the proposal is rejected on the ground of non compliance with the requisitions made in the said communication dated 11th April 2014.

3 Hence, there is no error apparent on the face of the record. Even otherwise, there is no ground for review. Hence, Notice of Motion and the review petition are rejected.

(K.R.SHRIRAM,J.)

(A.S.OKA,J.)