

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

Ramchandra Jadduram Pal	...Petitioner
Versus	
Additional Collector, City Mumbai and Ors.	...Respondents

• • • • •

Mr.Ashok K.Mishra for the Petitioner
Mr.H.S.Venegaonkar AGP for the Respondent No.1 and 2
Mr.Tejas Deshmukh for the Respondent No.4

• • • • •

**CORAM : ANOOP V. MOHTA &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATED: 12th July, 2017.

FINAL ORDER:

1. The Petitioner has challenged the order passed by High Power Committee dated 13.8.2009. Considering the averments made in paragraph No.11 about the aspect of delay, we are not convinced that any case is made out, as admittedly, Petitioner was represented in the year 2009, before the High Power Committee (HPC) through the advocate. Therefore, in view of un-explained delay and as no case is made out the Petition is dismissed. However, liberty is granted to the Petitioner to apply to the appropriate builder/ Respondent No.4 to consider his case on merits but in accordance with law.

2. Statement is made by the learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent No.4 builder that they will provide commercial premises as per his entitlement which is decided in the year 2009 as his name is also in annexure- 2. The Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.)

(ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.)