

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 2373 OF 2020
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.19491 OF 2022**

Vijay Jayantilal Modi & Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

The Chairman & Other Members

Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ...Respondents

...

Ms. Rubia Taneja, for Petitioner.

Mr. Abhijit Patil, i/b. Vijay Patil for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Mayur Khandeparkar, a/w. Harshil Parekh a/w. Mr. X. Barucha for Respondent No.3.

Mr. A. P. Vanarse, AGP for Respondent No.4.

...

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATE : 07 SEPTEMBER 2023.

P. C.:

Petitioners have raised grievance before the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee to the effect that the project undertaken for redevelopment is not a slum area. Petitioner would submit that Petitioners do not want to continue with the said grievance. They would participate in the development project by executing agreement with the Developer.

2. Mr. Khandeparkar learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.3 would submit that out of 12 Petitioners 06 Petitioners have already

been held eligible in the scheme and the rent in their respect has already been deposited by the developer with S.R.A. That said six eligible Petitioners can withdraw the same from S.R.A. So far as other six Petitioners, who are yet to prove their eligibility, he would submit that immediately upon said six Petitioners proving / establishing their eligibility, the Developer would deposit the rent in their respect with effect from the date of taking their possession of the structures.

3. Mr. Khandeparkar would further submit that Developer is willing to execute agreement for permanent alternate accommodation with the eligible Petitioners at par with other eligible slum dwellers within two weeks from today. He would submit that such agreements can be executed with the other Petitioners within two weeks from the date of establishment of their eligibility.

4. In view of statement made by Mr. Khandeparkar, the learned counsel for Petitioner Ms. Taneja would submit that the Petitioner would withdraw appeal filed before the AGRC.

5. Since the entire controversy is put to an end the learned counsel for Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw the Petition. Petition is disposed of as withdrawn.

KISHOR
VISHNU
KAMBLE

Digitally
signed by
KISHOR
VISHNU
KAMBLE
Date:
2023.09.15
12:12:34
+0530

SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.