

Amk

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 101 OF 2016

Amarnath Shyambihari Mishra & Ors. .. Petitioners
Vs.
Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. V. R. Tripathi for the Petitioners.
Mr. Atul Damle, Sr. Counsel i/b Mr. Anil D. Yadav for the Respondent No.14.
Mr. Rajesh Singh i/b Legal Liaisons for the Respondent Nos.7, 19 & 20.
Ms. Pallavi Thakar for the Respondent-MCGM.

**CORAM : SMT. VASANTI. A. NAIK AND
MR. RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, JJ.**
DATE : 8th DECEMBER, 2017.

P. C. :

Heard.

During the pendency of the writ petition, the matter was referred to the Technical Advisory Committee of the Corporation for submission of the report after following the directions in the judgment in Writ Petition (L) No. 1135 of 2014. The petitioners have not challenged the report of the TAC. The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners would be filing a writ petition for challenging the TAC report. It is stated that the ad interim relief granted by this Court on 22.07.2015 may be continued for a short time so that appropriate interim orders could be sought in the proposed petition. The learned counsel seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition.

The permission to withdraw the writ petition is granted. The writ petition stands disposed of as withdrawn. The points raised in the writ petition are kept open.

The ad interim relief granted on 22.07.2015 to continue for a period

of six weeks.

It is needless to mention that the petitioners would occupy the premises at their risk and costs.

Order accordingly. No costs.

[RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, J.]

[SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK J.]