

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10101 of 2024

Sascon Developers through its Partner
Arun Jagannath Shinde
VS

...Petitioner

Slum Rehabilitation Authority & Ors.

..Respondents

Mr. Vishwanath Patil with Mr. Akshay Naidu, for Petitioner.

Mr. Mayur Khandeparkar with Mr. Vikramjeet Garewal with Ajinkya Udane &
Mr. Vinayak Pandit and Sufyaan Mansuri, for Respondent No.4.

Mr. Deepak R. More with Mr. Shivram Gawade, for Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Dr. Dhruvi Kapadia, AGP for the State.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
AARTI SATHE, JJ.

DATE: 06 OCTOBER 2025.

P.C.

1. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is filed praying for the following substantive reliefs:

“(a) That this Hon’ble Court be pleased to issue writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ & order quashing & setting aside the impugned order dated 02.11.2023 passed by the Respondent No.1 i.e. Chief Executive Officer, Slum Rehabilitation Authority, Pune;

(b) That this Hon’ble Court be pleased to direct the Respondent No.1 to follow the guidelines issued under the circular dated & further be pleased to direct the Respondent No.1 i.e. Chief Executive Officer, Slum Rehabilitation Authority, Pune, to afford opportunity to the Petitioner to remove the discrepancies within a period of 15 days as per the said circular.”

2. Mr. Khandeparkar, learned Counsel for respondent No.4 as also supported by Mr. More, learned Counsel for the SRA submit that the petitioner has an alternate remedy to assail the impugned order before the Apex Grievance

Redressal Committee (for short 'AGRC'). In our opinion, considering the complexion of the proceedings, it would be appropriate that the petitioner files an appeal before the AGRC to challenge the impugned order dated 2 November 2023 passed by the Chief Executive Officer, SRA (CEO SRA), Pune. The petitioner is also permitted to file an interim application for any interim reliefs. Mr. Patil, learned Counsel for the petitioner, however, submits that some protection be granted till the petitioner moves the AGRC with the appropriate appeal and interim application praying for stay and for other reliefs. Responding to such contention, Mr. More, learned Counsel for SRA submits that insofar the rival proposal of respondent No.4, the same has not been registered and has not been granted a File Number.

3. In our opinion, let such status quo as on date continue for a period of four weeks. This is merely to enable the petitioner to obtain appropriate reliefs from AGRC, however, granting of such protection in no manner would reflect on the merit of the rival contentions. The AGRC shall consider the proceedings on its own merits. All contentions of the parties are expressly kept open. Let an appeal be filed within three weeks from today and if the same is accordingly filed, let the same be decided on its merit and without an objection of limitation.

4. The said proceedings be also served on all the respondents, so that they can file their respective replies and the AGRC can hear all the parties on the said application and pass appropriate orders.

5. Needless to observe that the AGRC, considering the limited protection

granted, shall hear the parties and pass appropriate orders as directed.

6. The petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(AARTI SATHE, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)