

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

**REVIEW PETITION NO. 9 OF 2022
IN
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 453 OF 2022**

Prithviraj Vardichand Jain ...Petitioner
Versus
M/s Sitaram Enterprise ...Respondent

**AND
REVIEW PETITION NO. 10 OF 2022
IN
CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 454 OF 2022**

Prithviraj Vardichand Jain ...Petitioner
Versus
M/s. Sitaram Enterprises ...Respondent

Mr. Ranjit Thorat, Sr. Counsel a/w. Adv. J. K. Shah & Adv. Pooja Shah i/b. R. J. Law for the petitioner.
Adv. S. Purohit a/w. Adv. Vishal Pauabiraman a/w. Adv. Amey Sawant for the respondent

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATED : 7th DECEMBER, 2022

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Thorat, learned senior counsel appearing for the review petitioner.
2. He would urge that the very requirement under sections 15(1) & 15(3) of the Maharashtra Rent Control Act cannot be satisfied in view of the date on which the notice was issued, the

suit was tendered for filing, the date of registration of the suit and issuance of summons.

3. As far as the aforesaid contentions are concerned, the same were never canvassed when the revision applicants were heard. That being so, it cannot be said that there is error apparent on the face of the records.

4. The both the review petitions stand dismissed.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)