

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 12279 OF 2025

Surekha Rashmikanth Oswal

... Petitioner

Versus

Chief Officer, Municipal Council Satara & Ors.

... Respondents

UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Digitally
signed by
UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Date:
2025.11.26
19:20:10
+0530

.....
Mr. Yuvraj Narvankar a/w Mr. Rahul Patil for the Petitioner.
Mr. Prabhanjan Gujar (through VC) a/w Mr. Sachin M. Bhavar for the
Respondent no.1.
Mr. V.M. Mali, AGP for the Respondent – State.
.....

**Coram : M. S. Karnik &
Ajit B. Kadethankar, JJ.**

Date : November 25, 2025.

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner has approached this court contending failure on the part of the respondent no.1 – Chief Officer, Municipal Council of Satara to take action against the unauthorized structure, which is subject matter of this petition. It is further submitted that this Court, by an order dated 18th December 2024, had directed respondent No.1 to decide the representation dated 7th October 2022 within time bound period. Inviting our attention to the report which is at Page No. 57 of paper book, it is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that

the respondent No.1 – Chief Officer had already passed an order for taking appropriate action in terms of Sections 52 and 53 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 (MRTP Act) and accordingly it was directed to issue notices. Such notices came to be issued. It is the grievance of the petitioner that despite issuance of notice, the respondent no.1 is not serious in dealing with the notices despite specific directions of the Court.

3. Learned counsel Mr. Gujar, appearing for the respondent No.1 submits that, it is in view of the civil proceedings filed by the members of the respondent No.5 that further action was not taken. It is further submitted that in the civil proceedings, request for temporary injunction was made. However, in some of the proceedings, injunction application has been rejected.

4. Accordingly, we direct the respondent No.1, if there are no legal impediments, to take the notices under Sections 52 and 53 to their logical conclusion within a period of 12 weeks from the date of the communication of this order.

5. The Writ Petition is disposed of.

[Ajit B. Kadethankar, J.]

[M. S. Karnik]