

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 2189 OF 2025

NDZ Infrastructure Private Limited & Ors ..Petitioners

Versus

Sanjeev Ramesh Chona & Ors ...Respondents

Mr. Rohan Sawant, i/b Neelam Salastikar, for the Petitioners.
Mr. Karl Shroff, with Ranjeev Carvalho, Sriraj Menon, Shubham
Hundia and Sandesh Panchal, i/b Satyaki Law Associates, for
Respondent No.1.
Adv M.S. Srivastava, AGP, for the Respondent-State.

CORAM: N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATED : 24th JUNE 2025

ORAL ORDER:

- 1.** Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
- 2.** The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 29th July 2024, passed by the Addl Divisional Commissioner, Konkan Division, under Section 44 of the Maharashtra Rent Control Act 1999, whereby the Revision Application preferred by the Petitioner against the judgment and order passed by the Competent Authority on 30th November 2023, came to be rejected.
- 3.** Though the impugned order is sought to be assailed on the merits of the matter, the principal objection is that the impugned order is bereft of reason. The submission appears impeccable. The Revisional

ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL

Digitally signed by
ARUN
RAMCHANDRA
SANKPAL
Date: 2025.06.25
18:16:29 +0530

Authority has simply noted the submissions canvassed on behalf of the Revision Applicant and the Respondent and, thereafter, proceeded to pass the order of rejection of the Revision Application.

4. The impugned order singularly lacks reason. No effort was made by the Revisional Authority to appreciate the rival contentions and ascribe reasons for deciding the Revision Application, one way or the other. It can not be over emphasised that the reasons are the soul of decision making process. Sans any reason the decision loses the essential characteristic of adjudication.

5. The Petition, therefore, deserves to be allowed on this sole ground, and the matter is required to be remitted back to the Revisional Authority, for afresh determination, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the parties and by ascribing reasons.

6. Hence the following order:

- (i) The Petition stands allowed.
- (ii) The impugned order dated 29th July 2024, passed by the Revisional Authority, stands quashed and set aside.
- (iii) Revision Application No. 428 of 2024 stands restored to the file of the Revisional Authority.
- (iv) The parties shall appear before the Revisional Authority on 7th July 2025.

(v) The Revisional Authority is directed to hear and decide Revisional Application afresh after providing an opportunity of hearing to the parties and by ascribing reasons, as expeditiously as possible.

(vi) It is clarified, this Court has not entered into the merits of the matter.

7. Petition stands disposed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]