

Arjun

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.14996 OF 2023**

Janardan S. Sharma

...Petitioner

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Pratik Sabrad i/b Amey C. Sawant, for the Petitioner.

Mr. P. G. Sawant, AGP, for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Samir Suryawanshi, for Respondent No.5.

Mr. Sanjiv Sawant a/w Ruchita Kadam, for Respondent No.6.

CORAM : MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED : DECEMBER 19, 2023

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Pratik Sabrad, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner, Mr. P. G. Sawant, learned AGP for the Respondent-State and Mr. Sanjiv Sawant, learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.6.

2. The Petitioner is challenging the legality and validity of the Order dated 1st September 2022 passed by the learned Additional Collector (E/R) & Appellate Authority, Eastern Suburbs, Mumbai in Appeal No.115 of 2022 as well as the Order dated 1st June 2023 passed by the Grievance Redressal Committee, Mumbai Suburban, Mumbai in Appeal No.89 of 2023.

3. The impugned Orders are passed on the ground that the name of the Petitioner is Mr. Janardan Shamnarayan Sharma

and the electricity meter report mentioned the name as Janardan Ramnarayan Sharma and, therefore, there is discrepancy. On the basis of that discrepancy, it has been held that the Petitioner is not eligible.

4. However, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner has pointed out letter dated 23rd December 2015 of the Additional Executive Engineer, the Electricity Distribution Company Limited, Mulund wherein the various details are given, including the consumer number, the name of the customer and the name of the transferee, if any. The same clearly shows that as far as the Consumer No.000094070503, the first date of the electricity connection is 26th March 1999 and the name of the customer is mentioned as Janardan Shamnarayan Sharma and the address mentioned is that of the subject slum structure. Thus, it is clear that Janardan Ramnarayan Sharma as mentioned in the report is a typographical mistake.

5. Accordingly, the impugned Orders are quashed and set aside. Resultantly, the Petitioner is held to be eligible with respect to structure at Sr. No.585 in the Annexure-II prepared by Respondent No.4 with respect to the SRA scheme in question.

6. The Writ Petition is disposed of in the above terms with no order as to costs.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]