

Ashwini

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.731 OF 2024

Mohammed Aslam Mohammed ...Petitioner

Versus

State Government of Maharashtra & Ors ...Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1977 OF 2024

Mohammed Salim Mohd Akbar Siddique ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors ...Respondents

Mr Omprakash Pandey, *with Pramila Prajapati & Suchita Pandey,*
for the Petitioner in both Petitions.

Ms Sneha Prabhu, *for Respondents Nos. 3 & 4-MHADA.*

Ms Shumayza Pathan, *for Respondents Nos. 8 & 9 in both Petitions.*

Mr Abhay L Patki, Addl. GP, *for the Respondent-State in*
WP/731/2024.

Ms Manisha Gawade, AGP, *for the Respondent-State in*
WP/1977/2024.

Mr Swapnil B, *i/b Sunil Sonawane, for the Respondent-BMC.*

Mr Matinuddin Moinuddin alias Matinuddin Moinuddin Shaikh,
Respondent No. 9, present.

CORAM: M.S. Sonak &
Kamal Khata, JJ

DATED: 30th September 2024

ASHWINI H
GAJAKOSH

Digitally signed by
ASHWINI H
GAJAKOSH
Date: 2024.10.01
15:05:37 +0530

PC:-

1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties.

2. In both these Writ Petitions, learned Counsel for the Petitioner and Respondents Nos. 8 and 9 hand in Consent Terms which are taken on record and marked “X” and “Y” respectively with today’s date.

3. The Petitioners in both these Petitions are present. They state that they have voluntarily signed these Consent Terms after understanding general scope and import. Mr Matinuddin Moinuddin alias Matinuddin Moinuddin Shaikh (Respondent No. 9) is present in Court. He states that he is the authorised partner of the 8th Respondent. He also states that he has signed these terms since he has full authority to sign the same. He says that he has signed these terms voluntarily after understanding their full scope and import. The Advocates have also signed the Consent Terms. They have identified the parties they represent.

4. We have perused the Consent Terms. We find that there is nothing therein which can be said to be opposed the public policy. Besides, there is nothing in these Consent Terms which will bind the statutory Respondents Nos. 1 to 7. In fact, the Petitioners are seeking to withdraw their Petitions qua Respondents Nos. 1 to 7.

5. Accordingly, Consent Terms are accepted. The statements and undertakings therein are accepted as statements and undertakings to this Court.

6. Both these Petitions are disposed of based on the Consent Terms. There shall be no order for costs.

7. The soft copy of the Consent Terms will be uploaded as the second order in this matter.

8. The Registry must ensure that the hard copy of the signed Consent Terms is permanently retained on file as part of the record and is not sent for destruction in the ordinary course.

(Kamal Khata, J)

(M.S. Sonak, J)