

Arun

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
CHAMBER ORDER NO. 944 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 2848 OF 2017**

Upendra L Shah & Ors	...Applicants
<i>In the matter between</i>	
Upendra L Shah & Ors	...Petitioners
<i>Versus</i>	
The Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority (MHADA) & Ors	...Respondents

Mr Girish Godbole, Ms Jai Kanade, i/b Sanjukta Dey, for the
Applicants/Petitioners.
Mr Kamlesh Ghumre, for Respondents Nos. 1 to 3.

CORAM: G.S. PATEL, J
DATED: 10th September 2018

PC:-

1. The matter is placed before me under Rule 133 of the Bombay High Court (Original Side) Rules. The Writ Petition was dismissed for non removal of one office objection, namely, that the power of attorney was “not shown”. I do not pretend to understand what this is supposed to mean exactly. Mr Godbole accepts this was a lapse that ought to have been rectified.

2. There is an opposition from 4th Respondent-Society that the Petitioners have been deliberately delaying the compliance with this and other objections. I will put the Petitioner to terms and allow time till 19th September 2018 to remove all office objections failing with the Petition will stand dismissed without further reference to the Court and will not be restored thereafter.
3. Upon restoration, i.e., upon compliance with these directions, the Registry will list the Writ Petition and the Chamber Summons before the appropriate Bench on a date convenient to that Bench.
4. The Chamber Order is disposed of in these terms.

(G. S. PATEL, J)