

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.42 OF 2012
IN
APPEAL NO.115 OF 2011
IN
WRIT PETITION (L) NO.3012 OF 2010**

Smt. Amarjeet Kaur w/o
Joginder Singh ... Petitioner
V/s.
Shri Kartik Bhatt ... Contemnor

Mumbai Housing and Area Development
Board (Mhada Unit) & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION (L) NO.64 OF 2016
IN
APPEAL NO.115 OF 2011
IN
WRIT PETITION (L) NO.3012 OF 2010**

Moon Land Builders Pvt. Ltd. ... Petitioner
V/s.
Amarjeet Kaur w/o Joginder Singh ... Contemnor/
Respondent No.1

Jaspal Singh ... Contemnor/
Respondent No.2

Mumbai Housing and Area Development
Board (MHADA unit) & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
CHAMBER SUMMONS (L) NO.1864 OF 2016
IN
CONTEMPT PETITION (L) NO.64 OF 2016**

Mr. Bhavesh Sawant i/by Ms. Minal Chandnani for the Petitioner in Contempt Petition No.42 of 2012 and for Respondent No.1 in Contempt Petition (L) No.64 of 2016.

Mr. Parth Turakhia i/by Karan Aiya for Respondent Nos.1 and 6 in Contempt Petition No.42 of 2012.

Mr. Parth Turakhia i/by Chaitanya Bhandarkar for the Petitioner in Contempt Petition (L) No.64 of 2016.

**CORAM : DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ. &
ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.**

DATE : 10th MAY 2024

P.C. :

This matter was placed on board pursuant to a praecipe filed on behalf of the Advocates for Respondent No.6.

2. Today, learned counsel submit that they have been informed by 'Neelam Arch' who was appointed to carry out the repair works in the said flat, that 'Neelam Arch' are solely empanelled as valuers and not engaged in contracting business

and thus unable to perform the mentioned work in the architect report. Thus, the parties are requested that an architect, who is able to carry out the concerned work, be appointed.

3. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that they would have no objection to any architect appointed by the Respondents.

4. Hence, in view of this, the parties to agree upon the name of an architect to carry out the said work by consent and only after agreeing such name and ascertaining as to whether such architect would be agreeable to carry out the work, parties are given liberty to move the Court including in the vacation for the limited purpose of appointment of such architect.

5. The praecipe is accordingly disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)