

sg

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO.2538 OF 2015**

M/s. Lakdawala Developers Pvt. Ltd.

...Petitioner

vs

The Maharashtra Housing and Area Development  
Authority & Ors.

...Respondents

.....  
Mr. Karan Bhosale, i/b. Mr. O.A. Siddiqui & Mr. Rajendra Rathod, for  
the Petitioner.

Ms. S.U. Deshmukh, for MHADA/Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Ms. K.H. Mastakar, for Respondent No.4-BMC.

Mr. Arshad Shaikh, i/b. Mr. Sunil Pandey, for Respondent Nos. 7 to 44.

.....  
**CORAM : S.C. GUPTA, J.**

**DATED: JULY 18, 2016**

**P.C. :**

. Heard learned Counsel for the parties. Learned Counsel tender minutes of order signed by the Advocates of the Petitioner and on behalf of Advocate for Respondent Nos.7 to 44. Learned Counsel for MHADA - Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 as well as learned Counsel for the 4<sup>th</sup> Respondent Municipal Corporation have not signed the minutes. Anyway, the contest really is between the Petitioner and Respondent Nos.5 to 44. Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 are individual tenants, who were represented by an Advocate earlier but are not appearing today. The other tenants and occupants, who are arraigned as Respondent Nos. 7 to 44 are represented by an Advocate, who supports the consent minutes of

order. In the light of this and considering the fact that the minutes of order tendered by Counsel for the Petitioner and Respondent No. 7 to 44 merely proceed on the basis of an order already passed by this Court on 9 February 2015, which is sought to be implemented in terms of the minutes proposed, this petition is disposed of in terms of minutes, which are taken on record marked “X” for identification. No order as to costs.

2. It is clarified that the word 'fresh consents' appearing in clauses (1) and (2) of the minutes would mean any consent obtained after the impugned order.

( S.C. GUPTE, J. )