

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 3998 OF 2025

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 3999 OF 2025

Mohammed Sajid Abdul Jabbar Patni

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. S. S. Kazi for Petitioner.

Ms. P. J. Gavhane, AGP for State in WP No.3998 of 2025.

Ms. T. J. Kapre, AGP for State in WP No.3999 of 2025.

Mr. Kevic Setawad, Sr. Adv. a/w Jehan Lalkaka, Nimish Kothare, Nikhil Mutha, Ashwini Sonawane, Hilla Boatwalla i/b M/s. Manu Hormasjee & Co., for Respondent No.3 in both petitions.

Ms. P. J. Gavhane, AGP for State.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
ADVAIT M. SETHNA, JJ.

DATE: 26 MARCH 2025

P.C.

1. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. As common issue as involved in both these petitions, we dispose of these petitions by this common order. For convenience we note the prayers as made in Writ Petition No. 3998 of 2025 which reads thus:

"(A). This Writ petition may kindly be allowed.

(B). By issuing writ of mandamus, or any other writ, or direction in the like nature, the impugned proceeding filed by respondent No.3

before respondent no.2 proceeding bearing NO. MSBW/Reg. Dept.
No. 160/1517/2025 be quashed."

3. We may observe that the proceedings were heard by the Maharashtra State Wakf Board on 20 March 2025. The petitioner has raised an objection to the said proceedings which is filed by respondent No.3 and more particularly contending that the Wakf Board would not have any jurisdiction to entertain such application. The Application in question as filed by respondent No.3 was dated 3 March 2025 wherein the petitioner had appeared and raised these objections. The orders to be passed by the Maharashtra State Wakf Board are awaited.

4. In this view of the matter, in our opinion, it is premature for the petitioner to maintain this petition. In the event, the contentions of the petitioner are not accepted and/or are rejected and any order adverse to the petitioner's interest is passed, it is open to the petitioner to pursue appropriate remedies as may be available in law. At this stage, we do not entertain these petitions.

5. Disposed of, however, keeping open all contentions of the parties. No costs.

(ADVAIT M. SETHNA, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)