

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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.3652 OF 2017

Mahendra R. Prajapati and Another	...Petitioners
vs.	
Slum Rehabilitation Authority and Ors.	...Respondents

Mr. Prasad Dani a/w. Prathamesh Kamath i/b. Mr. Santosh Pathak, for the Petitioners.

Mr. P.K. Dhakephalkar, Senior Advocate a/w. Mr. Rubin Vakil and Ms. Ruchi i/b. Matkand Gandhi, for Respondent No. 1.

Mr. Anoop Patil, for Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 and 9.

Mr. Chirag Balsara a/w. Mr. Dipesh Siroya i/b. Mr. Dipesh Siroya, for Respondent No. 7.

Mr. Atul Singh a/w. Ms. Reema Singh i/b. M/s. Hari Om Developer, for Respondent No. 8.

**CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &
R.G. KETKAR, JJ.**

DATE : DECEMBER 22, 2017

P.C.:

. Parties through their counsel.

2. Having gone through the impugned order dated 3rd November, 2017 (Exhibit “R”), we find that while passing order on the Petitioners' prayer for interim relief, the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee has not gone into the merits of the said prayer but has merely stated that the “Applicant has failed to make out the case for urgency”. After observing this the Committee has directed that “*Matter to be listed during the usual course of hearing*”.

3. The learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 9 – Committee submits that “*to be listed during usual course of hearing*” may be after a long time.
4. Keeping in view the fact that the prayer for interim relief need to be decided one way or other at the earliest, we are inclined to dispose of this Petition by directing the Committee to decide the Petitioners' prayer for interim relief or the Appeal itself, finally as expeditiously as possible preferably within one month from the date of appearance of the parties before the Committee.
5. The parties to appear before the Committee on 6th January, 2018 at 11.00 am.
6. The Petition is disposed of as such.

(R.G.KETKAR, J.)

(SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.)