



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

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 33 OF 2025

Rahul Sambhaji Tupe

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and ors.

.... Respondents

Mr Venkatesh Shinde a/w Mr Mayuresh Ingale, Mr Ishan Paradkar, for the Petitioner.

Mrs Neha S. Bhide, Government Pleader a/w Mr O. A. Chandurkar, Additional Government Pleader, Mrs. G. R. Raghuwanshi, AGP, for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr Amit Karle, for Respondent No.5 (City Corporation Limited).

***CORAM : ALOK ARADHE, CJ &
M. S. KARNIK, J.***

DATE : 8th APRIL, 2025

ORDER (PER M. S. KARNIK, J.) :

1. The PIL petitioner raises a grievance against the entire construction carried out at the Amanora Park Town, Hadapsar, Pune and challenges the permissions/sanctions granted to the project. Briefly stated the petitioner who claims to be an agriculturalist and also carries out small scale business for his sustenance is aggrieved by the alleged fraud and/or irregularities conducted by Respondent No.5-Developer in handing over the tenements specifically constructed as a part of social

housing component as free sale units. Though Respondent No.5 was aware that the social housing components have to be handed over to Respondent No.4, for unlawful gains, Respondent No.5 has acted to the detriment of all those who deserve tenaments as a part of social housing component.

2. The petitioner submits that an enquiry was initiated into the irregularities and the report dated 22nd December 2023 was presented before Respondent No.1-State Government, however the said report has not been acted upon.

3. The petitioner has prayed for a direction to Respondent Nos.1 to 4 to provide necessary documentation and records with respect to the social housing component in the Amanora Park Town project till date under the Integrated Town project regulations. The present PIL petition is not filed with all material particulars and in fact the PIL petitioner wants this Court to direct the respondents to furnish the necessary documents to the petitioner. It is always open for the aggrieved persons to raise a grievance if they are deprived of affordable social housing. The petitioner cannot be permitted to conduct a roving enquiry under the garb of filing the PIL Petition. If based on the complaint made by the petitioner, the enquiry report is not being acted upon, it is for the

petitioner to take recourse to appropriate remedies in law. We are not however inclined to entertain the present PIL Petition in its present form without any material particulars, at the behest of the petitioner.

4. Keeping the issues raised in the PIL Petition open, the PIL Petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)