

Jsn

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6512 OF 2015

Sou. Surekha Vasant Chougule ... Petitioner
Versus
The Pune Municipal Corporation & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Shriram Kulkarni, for the Petitioner.
Mr. Abhijit P. Kulkarni, for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
Mr. Vikas Mali, AGP for Respondent No.4.

**CORAM: SMT. VASANTI A NAIK AND
MR. RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, JJ.**
DATED: 6TH DECEMBER 2017

PC:-

Heard. It is stated on behalf of the petitioner that during the pendency of the writ petition the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act has been amended and Section 52 (A) is inserted in that Act by the amending Act, thereby giving an opportunity to the owners – occupiers of the illegal structures to get the structures compounded. It is stated that the petitioner is desirous of moving an application for compounding under Section 52(A) of the Act. It is stated that since the ad-interim relief was operating in favour of the petitioner till this date, the same may be continued for a reasonable time so that the petitioner could take appropriate steps. The learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with a view to avail the aforesaid remedy.

The request made on behalf of the petitioner is just and

reasonable. Hence, the writ petition stands disposed of as withdrawn. In pursuance of the prayer made by the petitioner, we continue the ad-interim relief for a period of three months. Order accordingly.

(RIYAZ I. CHAGLA J.)

(SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK, J.)