

nsc.

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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.258 OF 2018

M/s. Sovereign Tech Engineering Services Pvt. Ltd.
Through its Authorized Representative
Kalpesh Thakarshi Gosar ...Petitioner

Versus
Maharashtra Industrial Development
Corporation (MIDC) and Ors. ...Respondents

Mr.E.A.Sasi, for the Petitioner.

Ms.Shyamali Gadre a/w Mr.Praveen Thakur i/b Little & Co., for the
Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Mr.N.C.Walimbe, A.G.P. for the Respondent No.4- State.

***CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
REVATI MOHITE DERE, JJ.***

DATE : 22nd JANUARY, 2019

P.C. :

1. Heard for some time.
2. The impugned order dated 28th November, 2017 shows that request of Petitioner for allotment of additional plot No.A-516 has been declined as Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation (MIDC),

thought it proper to allot the same by resorting to a competitive bidding process.

3. The effort of the Petitioner is to show that when plot is sought for expansion and its area is less, the Petitioner needed to be given preference.

4. Learned Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3, without prejudice to her request for grant of time to file reply states that the request of the Petitioner has been looked into and thereafter a reasoned order has been passed. The Petitioner has not specifically claimed that there are no other applicants for said plot.

5. During argument, learned counsel for the Petitioner has invited our attention to the Guidelines on Land Allotment System of MIDC particularly Guideline No.3 dealing with Land Allotment on Priority Basis and Guideline No.4 for Land Allocation for Expansion Purpose.

6. The matter has remained pending with this Court without any

effective orders since 27th December, 2017. The Petitioner could have obtained necessary information under Right to Information Act and thereafter approached this Court. That has not been done.

7. We, in this situation, find that interest of justice can be met with, by giving leave to make an appropriate representation in this respect to Respondent No.2. If such a representation is made within two weeks, the Respondent No.2 shall pass suitable orders upon it, as per law, within next six weeks. If necessary, an opportunity of hearing shall be extended to the Petitioner.

8. With these directions, we dispose of this Petition.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.

B.P. DHARMADHIKARI, J.