

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.45 OF 2025

Urmiladevi Sahebodin Gautam ... Petitioner
Vs.
State of Maharashtra and others ... Respondents

Mr. A. N. Giri a/w. Mr. Sagar Batavia for Petitioner.
Ms. Gouri Sawant, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 3 - State.
Mr. Kedar Nhavkar i/b. Mr. Vishwanath Patil for Respondent No.4 - SRA.
Mr. Alok Kumar Singh for Respondent No.5.
Mr. Kiran S. Mohite for Respondent No.6.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.
DATE : OCTOBER 06, 2025

P.C. :

1. The petitioner has challenged orders passed by respondent No.3 - Additional Collector and respondent No.2 - Grievance Redressal Committee. A perusal of the impugned orders shows that the petitioner went with a case to the respondent No.3 - Additional Collector on the basis that her name ought to be included in Annexure II at Sr.No.37 instead of one 'Ramprasad Ramsumer Jaiswal'.

2. It is undisputed that the name of the husband of the petitioner along with the said Ramprasad Ramsumer Jaiswal found mention at Sr.No.37 of Annexure II. Initially, they were held as ineligible in the year 2011. It is also a matter of record that in the year 2022, the husband of the petitioner expired.

3. But, when the petition was called out for hearing today, the learned counsel appearing for respondent No.6 i.e. the developer produced photocopy of a supplementary Annexure II dated 18.07.2013, recording that the husband of the petitioner i.e. Sahebodin Khaderu

Gautam and the said Ramprasad Ramsumer Jaiswal were both held jointly eligible. This changes the whole complexion of the dispute sought to be raised by the petitioner. This Court is further informed by the learned counsel appearing for respondent No.6 - developer that, as on today, the petitioner is in a transit accommodation and that rent is being paid to the said Ramprasad Ramsumer Jaiswal.

4. The aforesaid document i.e. supplementary Annexure II dated 18.07.2013 is taken on record and marked 'X' for identification. In the light of the said document brought to the notice of this Court, the grievance of the petitioner would not survive as she would be at liberty to take appropriate steps in light of her deceased husband having been found eligible in the supplementary Annexure II.

5. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of.

6. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Minal Parab