

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.147 OF 2025

MANJU HOSHIYARCHAND SANGHAVI. ...Petitioner  
VS  
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF GREATER  
MUMBAI ...Respondents.

Mr. Sharad Bansal with Mr. Sunil Gangan with Mr. S. M. Seegarla with Mr. Siddharth Shibu i/b. RMG Law Associates, for Petitioner.

Mr. Zahan Satalvad with Hiten Raut i/b. Sharad Wakchoure, for Respondent Nos.4 to 7.

Ms. Meena Dhuri i/b. Ms. Komal Punjabi, for Respondent No.1 BMC.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &  
AARTI SATHE, JJ.

DATE: 23 September 2025

P.C.

1. We have heard learned Counsel for the parties.
2. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is filed praying for the following substantial reliefs:

“a) This Hon’ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus (or any other appropriate writ) directing the MCGM to cancel all the permissions and certificates granted to the Developer for the construction of the redeveloped Building till such time as the Society and the Developer provides sufficient and adequate proof of having entered into a permanent alternate accommodation agreement with the Petitioner.

b) This Hon’ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus (or any other appropriate writ ) directing the MCGM to issue a stop-work notice on the redevelopment of the building till such time as the Developer provide sufficient and adequate proof of having entered into a permanent alternate accommodation agreement with the Petitioner.

c) This Hon’ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus (or any other appropriate writ) directing the Respondent Nos.2 and 3 to revoke all permissions for redevelopment of the building till such time as the Developer provides sufficient and adequate proof of having

entered into a permanent alternate accommodation agreement with the Petitioner.”

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has fairly stated that the draft of the Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement (for short ‘PAAA’) was received by the petitioner from MHADA. Respondent No.4 who is the owner and developer is represented by Mr. Setalvad. Learned Counsel for respondent No.4 has also made a statement that PAAA between the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No.4 be finalized and accordingly, the same would be duly stamped and registered within a period of two weeks from today. We accept the said statement.

4. Insofar as the transit rent is concerned, learned Counsel for respondent No.4 states that a fresh cheque would be issued to the petitioner within a period of one week from today.

5. There is issue in regard to the parking. Having heard learned Counsel on this issue, we are of the opinion that if the parking is entitled to the petitioner under the Development Control and Promotion Regulation, 2034, we keep such issue expressly open to incorporate in the PAAA.

6. In view of the aforesaid fair stand taken by the parties, further adjudication of the petition is not called for.

7. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. No costs.

(AARTI SATHE, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)