

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

WRIT PETITION NO.4978 OF 2025

Pramod Lalchandra VetaPetitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.Respondents

Mr. P. Ranjan Yadav i/b. Mr. Ravikant Maurya for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Nisha Mehra, AGP for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Soham Bhalerao i/b. DSK Legal for Respondent No.2 –
CIDCO.

Mr. Ravindra S. Pachundkar for the N.M.M.C.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

&

ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 17th NOVEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1. This Petition is filed by Pramod Lalchandra Veta. His grievance is that there are rampant, illegal and dangerous constructions carried out by builders in connivance with public servants in areas such as Nerul, Belapur and Juinagar of Navi Mumbai. He states that he is a social worker and works for the betterment and welfare of the society, particularly for the poor and underprivileged persons in his vicinity, i.e., the outskirts of Navi Mumbai. He is always vocal about rampant illegal and dangerous constructions by builders.

2. The learned Advocate representing CIDCO points out that the original landowner was one Kashinath Veta. The Petitioner is the cousin of Manoj Kashinath Veta, the son of Kashinath Veta, who has now inherited the land.

3. We noticed from the pleadings in the Petition that the Petitioner has not even arrayed Manoj Kashinath Veta, the present landowner, as a Respondent. Details regarding the alleged illegal construction, have not been set out. There is no research made by the Petitioner to bring details about the purported illegality in the development plan/construction plan/construction permission, or the magnitude of the construction, before the Court.

4. The learned Advocate for CIDCO points out that Manoj Kashinath Veta has instituted a Regular Civil Suit No.338 of 2024 before the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Belapur, challenging notices issued by the Corporation under Sections 53(1) and 54(1) of the MRTP Act. The Petitioner moved an application for intervention, claiming that he has interest in the said issue and sought intervention in the pending Suit. By an order dated 15th October 2025, the Trial Court noticed that the Petitioner was neither an answering nor a necessary Respondent and rejected his application.

This order has been passed after the present Petition was filed. Needless to state, *prima-facie*, the Petitioner is found to be unconnected with the dispute, by the Trial Court. The facts pertaining to Regular Civil Suit No.338 of 2024 have not been disclosed by the Petitioner in this Petition.

5. We were inclined to dismiss this Petition with costs in the light of the facts recorded above. However, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner pleaded that costs may not be imposed.

6. In view of the above, **this Petition is dismissed**, without imposing costs.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)