



Niti

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.499 OF 2024

DINESH SINARI AND ANR

... PETITIONERS

Versus

**STATE OF GOA, THR. ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 3 ORS**

... RESPONDENTS

Mr Abhay Nachinolkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr Tukaram Gawas, Additional Government Advocate for
Respondent No.1.

Mr H.D. Naik, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

Mr V. Braganza, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

Mr Rohit Bras De Sa, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

**CORAM:- BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 10th June, 2025

ORAL ORDER : (Per Bharati Dangre, J.)

The petitioners sought issuance of a writ of mandamus against the NGPDA to consider and decide their application for regularisation preferred on 10.06.2023 within a stipulated period.

2. The challenge is also raised in the petition to an order dated 13.02.2024. The order dated 13.02.2024 passed by the Commissioner of the Corporation of City of Panaji under Section 269 of the Panaji Corporation Act to remove/demolish the construction on the premises known as Sinari Apartments, failing which, the order was directed to

be executed.

3. This order came to be upheld by the Secretary for Urban Development Department, the Appellate Authority on 04.06.2024.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner has placed before us an order passed by the Commissioner upon the regularisation application filed by the petitioners and the regularisation is granted subject to certain stipulations contemplated in the order dated 27.05.2025.

5. The learned counsel has instructions to make the statement that pursuant to the regularisation order being passed, prayer clause (i) in the petition does not survive. As far as prayer clause (ii) is concerned, the challenge is raised to the order dated 13.02.2024 as well as the order dated 04.06.2024. However, in the wake of the order passed on 27.05.2025, issuing the revised construction licence as per the approval granted by the NGPDA for the revised plan subject to the stipulations, the counsel is not desirous of prosecuting the petition and, hence, it is disposed of.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.