

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

WRIT PETITION NO.6490 OF 2024

Firoz Yusuf Khan

....Petitioner

V/S

Taraben Karasandas Thakker & Ors.

....Respondents

Mr. Akram Kapoor *for the Petitioner.*

Mr. Dhiraj M. Zokande with Mr. Q.A. Walvatkar *for Respondent No.2.*

Ms. Priyanka B. Chavan *for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.*

CORAM: SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

DATE : 12 JUNE 2024.

P.C.:

1 The Petition is filed challenging the order dated 18 March 2024 passed by the Additional Divisional Commissioner, Konkan Division as Revisional Authority rejecting Revision Application filed by the Petitioner and confirming the order dated 16 October 2023 passed by the Competent Authority, Rent Control Act Court, Konkan Division, Mumbai.

2 I have heard the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the Respondents. After having considered the submissions canvassed by the learned counsel appearing for the parties, there is no dispute to the position that the License Agreement has expired on 31

January 2015. In that view of the matter, I do not see any reason why the Petitioner should not vacate the licensed premises. The only point that is sought to be canvassed by the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner is that Respondent No.2, who has purchased the licensed premises from Respondent No.1, cannot invoke jurisdiction of the Competent Authority under Section 24 of the Maharashtra Rent Control Act (**the Act**). The said contention was also raised before the Competent Authority, which has been repelled by referring to Section 41 of the Act, under which the landlord includes even a person who is a successor in interest. In my view, therefore, no valid ground is made out for interference in the impugned orders. The Writ Petition is accordingly rejected.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

Digitally
signed by
SUDARSHAN
RAJALINGAM
KATKAM
Date:
2024.06.13
16:54:38
+0530