vks

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.420 OF 2019

Mohd Ali Mohd. Farid … Petitioner
V/s.
The Union of India … Respondent

ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION (L) NO.421 OF 2019

Mohd Sadique Shaikh … Petitioner
V/s.
The Union of India … Respondent

ALONGWITH
WRIT PETITION (L) NO.423 OF 2019

Rampiuran Lataprasad Yadav … Petitioner
V/s.
The Union of India … Respondent

- Ms. Aarti Kulkarni a/w Mr. Nilesh Parab i/by Sachin Masurkar, for the Petitioner.
- Mr. Chetan Agrawal a/w Shrishety Punjabi, Pravin Mengane, for respondents.

CORAM : G. S. KULKARNI, J.

DATE : 1st MARCH, 2019.

P.C. :

1] By these petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners are challenging the order dated 10.12.2018 passed by the Estate Officer of the respondent under Section 5-A(2) of the Public

Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971 (for short "the Act"), calling upon the petitioners to vacate the premises as illegally constructed on the railway land, failing which an eviction action would be resorted to forcibly evict the petitioners.

2] The petitioners are, thus, facing eviction in pursuance of the impugned orders. Learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions, from the petitioners, who are present before the Court submits that the petitioners are willing to vacate the suit structure by 31st May, 2019 and to that effect undertakings of the respective petitioners are being placed on record. The undertakings are taken on record and marked "X-1", "X-2" and "X-3".

3] Mr. Agarwal, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of respondent on instructions is also agreeable that in view of the undertakings of the petitioners as placed on record, the respondent would not take any coercive action of eviction against the petitioners up to 30th May, 2019. The undertakings as submitted by the petitioners are accordingly accepted. The petitioners shall vacate their respective premises/structures on the railway land on or before 30th May, 2019.

4] The petitions are accordingly disposed of in above terms. No costs.

5] It is clarified that the petitioners would not entitled for any further extension to retain the premises.

[G. S. KULKARNI, J]