

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

WRIT PETITION NOS.7375, 5177, 5178, 5257, 5258 AND 7376 of 2013

NTPC LimitedPetitioner
versus
The Collector of Stamps, Kurla and ors.Respondents

Mr. M. A. Choudhari along with Ms. Kanchan Pawar, advocate for the petitioner.

Mrs. M. P. Thakur, AGP for the State.

Mr. P. G. Lad along with Ms. Sayli Apte, advocate for MHADA-respondent No.4.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT.ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATE : 13th JULY, 2018.

P. C. :

Mr. Chaudhari, learned counsel for the petitioner, at the outset, submits that the petitioner would be satisfied if the Chief Officer of Mumbai Baord- MHADA is directed to decide the petitioner's application dated 5th August, 2009, regarding request for issuance for flat wise allotment letter pertaining to the 75 residential flats and 15 parking spaces purchased by the petitioner at 20, A. S. Marg, Powai. A copy of the said application is annexed at "Exhibit- J" and "Exhibit- I" respectively.

2. Mr. Lad, learned counsel for MHADA submits that earlier the petitioner filed writ petition No.896 of 2014 and that petition was

disposed of on 23rd September, 2014, by passing the following order:

“ The petitioner is seeking a writ, order and direction, directing respondent No.2 to decide the pending application of the petitioner seeking allotment of a flat. If this is the only relief prayed for by the petitioner, the petition can be conveniently disposed of by directing respondent No.2 to decide the petitioner's pending application as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of sixteen weeks. All contentions of the petitioner are kept open. With these observations, the petition is disposed of.”

3. Mr. Chaudhari, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the subject matter of the writ petition No.896 of 2014 was the very same representation dated 5th August, 2009 and despite the order passed in writ petition 896 of 2014, this representation was not disposed of and consequently, the impugned order came to be passed by the Chief Controlling Revenue Authority, Maharashtra State, Pune.

4. Mr. Lad, learned counsel for MHADA, makes a statement that if the said application is not disposed of earlier, it would be decided as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of this order. The statement is accepted.

5. In the light of above, nothing survives for the consideration of this Court. The writ petitions are, accordingly, disposed of.

[SMT.ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]