



Suzana

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.71 OF 2025

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.422 OF 2025

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.71 OF 2025

BHARATLAL HALWAI AND ANR

... APPLICANTS

Versus

MORMUGAO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL THR.

ITS CHIEF OFFICER AND 2 ORS

... RESPONDENTS

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.422 OF 2025

BHARATLAL HALWAI AND ANR

... PETITIONERS

Versus

MORMUGAO MUNICIPAL COUNCIL THR.

ITS CHIEF OFFICER AND 2 ORS

... RESPONDENTS

Mr Vishal Sawant, Advocate with Mr Savio Misquita, Advocate for the Applicants.

Mr Sudesh M. Usgaonkar, Senior Advocate with Ms Marie Rosette Pereira, Advocate for the Respondents.

CORAM:- VALMIKI MENEZES, J.

DATED :- 10th December, 2025

P.C.

1. Registry to waive office objections and register the matter.
2. This is an application for seeking extension of time granted under Order of 11.11.2025 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.422 of 2025 for dismantling the solar panel structure fabricated by the Petitioner on the rooftop of Mendes Apartment. The sole reason given in the application for seeking extension of time was that the

impugned order, which was otherwise dictated in open Court on 11.11.2025, was uploaded on 17.11.2025 after which, a review was filed on 27.11.2025 and listed on 09.12.2025. The Applicant claims that almost one full month has elapsed after the order was uploaded and the review was decided, and hence seeks an extension by four weeks to remove the solar panel.

3. From the record, it appears that the Petitioner had given an Undertaking to this Court, recorded in the interim order dated 31.05.2023, stating that he would dismantle the solar panel structure on the rooftop of Mendes Apartment if this Petition is dismissed. At the time this Court passed its order dated 11.11.2025, it specifically referred to the Undertaking given by the Petitioner at paragraph 15 of its judgment and directed the Petitioner, in terms of the Undertaking, to dismantle the solar panel by 12.12.2025. At the relevant time, the Petitioner had not sought any extension of time given in the Undertaking. The reason that the review application was pending cannot be countenanced for the purpose of extending time to implement the Undertaking.

Consequently, the application stands dismissed.

VALMIKI MENEZES, J.