

Jvs.

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 826 OF 2024

Gajra Home Builders Pvt. Ltd.	}	Petitioner
		versus
State of Maharashtra & Ors.	}	Respondents

Mr. R. D. Soni with Mr. Vipin Kasle and Ms. Sonali Dahotre for petitioner.

Ms. Neha S. Bhide, Government Pleader with Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Additional Government Pleader and Ms. G. R. Raghuwanshi, AGP for respondents 1 and 3.

Ms. P. M. Bhansali for respondent no. 2.

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE: JUNE 13, 2025

ORDER: (Per Chief Justice)

1. With consent of learned counsel for the parties, writ petition is heard finally.

2. In this petition, the petitioner has assailed the validity of the orders dated 19th May 2022 and 18th April 2023 passed by the City and Industrial Development Corporation of Maharashtra (CIDCO), by which, the bid of the petitioner in respect of Plot No. 7, Situated at Sector 38, Kharghar, Navi Mumbai (hereinafter referred to as "the subject plot") has been rejected on the ground of administrative reasons despite the petitioner being the highest bidder.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the instant writ petition, the CIDCO had issued a fresh tender in respect of the subject plot, which has subsequently been cancelled. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the petitioner has submitted a representation on 9th June 2025 to the CIDCO and the instant writ petition be disposed of with a direction to the CIDCO to consider the said representation, expeditiously.

4. Learned counsel for the CIDCO submits that the fresh tender was cancelled as the CIDCO wanted to merge the subject plot into a larger plot. However, it is fairly submitted by her that the representation submitted by the petitioner shall be considered on its own merits.

5. In view of the aforesaid submission and in the facts and circumstances of the case, the instant writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the CIDCO to consider and decide the representation submitted by the petitioner by a speaking order within a period of three weeks.

6. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

JAYANT
VISHWANATH
SALUNKE

Digitally signed by
JAYANT VISHWANATH
SALUNKE
Date: 2025.06.13
19:24:43 +0530

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)