

short the “said Act”). It is not in dispute that the subject building has been already demolished on the basis of the impugned notice dated 25.11.2013. Though prayer clause (a-1) seeks to challenge the said notice under Section 354 of the said Act, there is no consequential relief prayed for regarding reconstruction either against the first Respondent or the second Respondent. All other prayers, viz. (b-1), (c-1), (d-1), and (d-3) seek a writ of mandamus against third and fourth Respondents, who are private parties. Therefore, a writ of mandamus cannot be issued against the third and fourth Respondents. As far as prayer clause (d-2) is concerned, the Petitioner seeks injunction restraining first Respondent – Corporation from granting IOD and CC to the third and fourth Respondents for redevelopment of the building before entering into agreements with all the tenants for providing permanent alternate accommodation to them. In substance, this relief is also sought against third and fourth Respondents.

2. Therefore, in writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, reliefs in terms of prayer clauses (b-1), (c-1) and (d-1) to (d-3) cannot be granted. As far as prayer clause (a-1) is concerned, the Petitioner will have to seek appropriate remedy before

the appropriate forum. We also clarify that Petitioner or its members can also seek appropriate remedy against Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 before the appropriate forum. Subject to what is stated above, we decline to entertain the petition. Writ petition is accordingly disposed of. All contentions on merits are kept open.

Sd/-
[P. N. DESHMUKH, J.]

Sd/-
[A. S. OKA, J.]

Vinayak Halemath