

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

PRACHI
PRANESH
NANDIWADEKAR

Digitally signed
by PRACHI
PRANESH
NANDIWADEKAR
Date: 2025.02.12
14:30:29 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO.2033 OF 2025

Lalit Atur Sangtani

.. Petitioner

Versus

Union Territory Administration of

Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu & Ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. D.B. Zaveri for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. S. Venegaonkar for respondent nos.1 to 4.

CORAM : M. S. Sonak &

Jitendra Jain, JJ.

DATE : 11 February 2025

PC:-

1. Heard Mr. Zaveri, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Venegaonkar, learned counsel for respondent nos.1 to 4.

2. The petitioner claims to be the owner of the property being Survey No.679/1P admeasuring about 2365.54 sq.mtrs. situated at Village Naroli, Taluka and District of Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The petitioner complains that the respondents have demolished a compound wall constructed by the petitioner on the northern side of this property. The petitioner contends that this is because the respondents intend to utilise a portion of this property on the northern side admeasuring 75.90 sq.mtrs. The petitioners apprehends that he would be dispossessed of this portion of 75.90 sq.mtrs. without the respondents following due process of law.

3. Mr. Venegaonkar, learned counsel for the respondents submits that without prejudice to the issue of petitioner's ownership or the legality of the compound wall, the respondents to whom he represents

will negotiate with the petitioner and if some agreed figure can be arrived at towards compensation for the demolition of compound wall, the same would be paid to the petitioner. He states that this exercise would be completed within four weeks from today. The petitioner is also agreeable to meet the respondents and discuss the compensation he is willing to accept for the demolition of the compound wall. If ultimately, the petitioner is not satisfied with the compensation amount, it will be open to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings like a civil suit for recovery of this compensation amount.

4. Insofar as the apprehension of dispossession from the portion of 75.90 sq.mtrs. is concerned, Mr. Venegaonkar, on instructions, states that there is no intention to dispossess the petitioner without following the due process of law. Accordingly, this statement is accepted and the petition is disposed of.

5. There shall be no order for costs.

6. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

(Jitendra Jain, J.)

(M. S. Sonak, J.)