

pdp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 2519 OF 2016

Shri Mahandra Anant Patil

.. Petitioner

Vs.

City and Industrial Development
Corporation and ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. S. R. Mishra for petitioner.

Mr. D. A. Athavale for respondent nos.1 and 2.

CORAM: NARESH H. PATIL &
M. S. KARNIK, JJ.

FEBRUARY 14, 2017.

P.C.

1. The petitioner challenges notice dated 8/8/2013 issued by respondent nos.1 and 2 (Exhibit "A"). Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner submitted an application/representation dated 8/1/2016, but so far the CIDCO authorities have not decided the same. Nothing is communicated to the petitioner in respect of the subject matter of this petition.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the CIDCO submits that appropriate decision would be taken in accordance with the record on the

application/representation submitted by the petitioner, annexed at Exhibit C-2 to the petition.

3. In the facts, we pass following order:-

- (a) We direct the respondents - CIDCO to take appropriate decision on the applicant/representation submitted by the petitioner, annexed at Exhibit C-2 dated 8/1/2016 on its own merits.
- (b) The respondents - CIDCO is entitled to hear the petitioner, if found necessary. The respondents – CIDCO shall pass a brief reasoned order, which shall be communicated to the petitioner. The decision shall be taken within four weeks from today.
- (c) In case the decision is adverse to the petitioner, status quo as on today shall be maintained for two weeks from the date of service of the order on the petitioner.

4. Petition is disposed of accordingly.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)