

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 1744 OF 2025**

Arjun Jayram Sawant

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. C. K. Tripathi for Petitioner.

Mr. Milind Gore, Addl. G.P. for State.

Ms. Ketki Gadkari with Mr. Kaustubh Thipsay for Respondent No.4.

**CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
ARIF S. DOCTOR, JJ.
DATE: 17 JUNE 2025.**

P.C.

1. The petitioner has filed this petition which raises a serious controversy on allotment of LIG plots by MHADA as far as back in the year 1996 at Gorai-III, Borivali, Mumbai. His contention is that 368 plots were allotted under the category of 'LIG', however, despite such allotment about 30 years back, not a single plot has been developed and/or utilized for the purpose for which it was granted.

2. For a period of 30 years, the LIG plots cannot be developed that too in Mumbai is unthinkable. This raises a serious question and/or suspicion as to whether all these allotments were legitimate/genuine allotments as intended to further the cause of the so called LIG applicants. These plots have remained unutilized and not developed. The petitioner has also made serious allegations of illegal dealing of these plots by a developer who was purportedly appointed by an alleged society formed by the so called allottees. It is petitioner's case that the developer is now transferring these LIG plots, misusing such allotments by some

method that the plots are being actually transferred in favour of the developer and/or his relatives/ representatives. If this be so, it is a very serious issue. In such context, the petitioner has also impleaded the Directorate Enforcement as also the Director General of Anti Corruption Bureau as the party respondents who are the State authorities and who are under respondent no.1/State of Maharashtra.

3. *Prima facie* we find that the grievance of the petitioner is quite serious. As to how the MHADA has actually dealt with these plots and whether these allotments are at all genuine is the question and if the allegations as made by the petitioner in regard to the developer is concerned, it is a further serious matter.

4. We would accordingly direct respondent no.3-the Vice President of MHADA to file on record a reply affidavit.

5. We also direct the Principal Secretary, Housing Department to examine the issues and place on record a reply affidavit. The other respondents shall also file their respective affidavits. Depending on the reply affidavits, which would be placed on record, the prayers of the petitioner for any other orders to be passed for respondent nos.6 and 7 to look into the issues, would thereafter be considered by the Court.

6. In the meantime, we direct that respondent nos.4 and 5 shall not in any manner whatsoever deal with the said plots and/or undertake any development.

7. Stand over to **01 July 2025 (H.O.B.)**.

(ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)