

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (L) NO. 9 OF 2019

Sterling Buildcon Pvt. Ltd. ... Review Petitioner

Versus

Shreeman Real Estates Developers
LLP and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Vaibhav Jogalekar a/w Mr. Manesh Parekh i/by Purnanand &
Co. for the petitioner in Review Petition.

Mr. Hemant Harayan, AGP for respondent no. 4.

Mr. V.D. Patil for respondent no. 5.

Mr. Anand Singh for respondent nos.1 to 3.

**CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
REVATI MOHITE DERE, JJ.
[IN CHAMBERS]**

DATE : MARCH 28, 2019

P.C.:

Heard respective counsel for Review Petitioner (Original respondent no. 5) and original petitioners. Also heard learned AGP for respondent no.4 and counsel for respondent no. 5. Nobody appears for respondent nos. 6 and 7. Respective counsel however, fairly state that looking to the nature of the prayers made, respondent nos. 6 and 7 are not necessary at this stage.

2. Effort of respondent no. 5 is to show that the petitioners have no locus in the matter and the order of this Court dated 6/3/2019 may be projected as conferring such status upon them. While arguing our attention is also drawn to the pamphlets alleged to be circulated contending that the petitioners have published and distributed it. It is also pointed out that names of the Judges party to the order dated 06/03/2019 are also mentioned therein and in one of the pamphlets they are expressly thanked. Counsel for respondent nos.1 to 3 in the present review petition (original petitioners) has tendered reply affidavit and denied the role of the petitioners in either publication or distribution of the pamphlets.

2. We find the issuance, printing, publication and distribution of pamphlets with the names of the Judges is highly objectionable. The act of thanking them also cannot be countenanced.

3. While passing the order on 06/03/2019, we have taken a note of the fact that original respondent no. 5 was not present before the Court and hence, in paragraph 3 we have protected the present review petitioner i.e. original respondent no. 5 in the writ petition sufficiently. Thus the contention about lack of locus in original petitioners is also kept open and can be evaluated by respondent no. 2 if occasion therefor arises.

4. In view of this clarification, we find that no further clarification or orders on review petition are warranted. Review Petition is accordingly disposed of.

(REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.)

(B.P. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)