SUNNY ANKUSHRAO THOTE
Digitally signed by SUNNY ANKUSHRAO THOTE
Date: 2025.12.10 10:18:22 +0530

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 16941 OF 2024
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1011 OF 2025

Chandrakant Krushnaji Ingawale & Anr. ...Petitioners

Versus

Thane Municipal Corporation & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Vikram Walawalkar, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Kishor Patil i/by Mr. Pratik Rahade, Advocate for the Applicants

Mr. Suryajeet R. i/by Mr. Subhashchandra Pawar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Sachin Dhakephalkar, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 9th DECEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that notices were issued twice to the Corporation and their learned Advocate.

2. The only issue raised by the Petitioner is that the Corporation, has already issued a notice dated 5th July, 2024 and the last notice dated 19th August, 2024, bringing it to the notice of

Respondent No.2, who has erected a hoarding mentioned in the pleadings in the Petition, beyond the permission granted and which clearly appears to be an oversized hoarding.

3. The learned Advocate for the Corporation, who has been twice intimated, has no instructions.

4. We, therefore, direct the Corporation to ensure that the notice dated 5th July, 2024 and the last notice dated 19th August, 2024 be taken to a logical end by following the due procedure laid down in law. If it is found that the hoarding is oversized and in defiance of the permission granted, the hoarding shall be removed and Respondent No.2 shall be imposed with costs for having violated the permission granted. So also, if it is noticed that Respondent No.2 is repeatedly indulging in such acts, steps in accordance with law be initiated to blacklist Respondent No.2 and restrain it from receiving any further orders for erecting such hoardings.

5. The learned Advocate representing Respondent No.2 sought a pass over and submits on instructions, after the lunch recess, that the offending hoarding will be removed and since the

Petitioner has brought to the notice of the Court that the NOC is revoked by the landlord, the entire hoarding along with the scaffolding, will be removed.

6. As such, we direct that, after the Corporation issues notice to Respondent No.2 calling upon it to explain as to why it should not be blacklisted, Respondent No.2 would show cause and file an affidavit undertaking stating therein that, no such illegal hoarding would be erected any time in future and if, one more instance of such illegal hoarding by Respondent No.2 is noticed, the Corporation shall order its blacklisting.

7. In view of the above, **this Writ Petition is disposed off**. **The pending Interim Application** would not survive and **stands disposed off**.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.) **(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)**