

Vidya Amin

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

**APPEAL FROM ORDER No. 1051 OF 2014
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION No. 1267 OF 2014**

Baburam Ramdin Pal	... Appellant
Vs.	
The Mumbai Metropolitan Regional Development Authority	... Respondent

None present for the appellant.
Mr. Kuldeep S. Patil, Advocate for the respondent.

CORAM: MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.
DATE: 29th January, 2018.

P.C.:

When the matter was called out, none present for the appellant.

The suit was filed for direction that the respondent/MMRDA to scrutinize the documents of the plaintiff/appellant to decide the eligibility and to provide alternate accommodation. Notice of Motion No. 1916 of 2013 was dismissed by order dated 3rd February, 2014 by the learned Judge of the City Civil Court, Borivali Division, Dindoshi in S.C. Suit No. 2293 of 2013. The record shows that the counsel for the appellant did not take steps after the Application for condonation of delay was allowed.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent produced the print out

of the case status. He submitted that Case No. 2293 of 2013 was kept for dismissal on 11th November, 2016 and it was dismissed.

3. None present for the appellant, hence Appeal from Order is dismissed.

4. Civil Application is also accordingly disposed of.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)