

SUNNY
ANKUSHRAO
THOTE
Digitally signed
by SUNNY
ANKUSHRAO
THOTE
Date: 2025.09.10
11:22:42 +0530

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2919 OF 2025

Sanjeev Shiva Shetty

...Petitioner

Versus

The Municipal Corporation of Greater
Mumbai & Ors.

...Respondents

**WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 26472 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 2919 OF 2025**

Sunderraj Venkappa Hegde

...Applicant

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN

Sanjeev Shiva Shetty

...Petitioner

Versus

The Municipal Corporation of Greater
Mumbai & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Sajid Shamim a/w Adv. S. Lakdawala i/by S. Shamim & Co.,
Advocate for the Petitioner/Applicant.

Adv. Pushpa Yadav a/w Ms. Meena Dhuri i/by Adv. K. Punjabi,
Advocate for Respondent Nos.1, 2, 4, 6 & 9.

Mr. Rakesh Pathak, AGP for Respondent Nos.3, 5 & 8/State.

Mr. Satish Kamat, Advocate for Respondent No.7.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

DATE : 8th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :-

1. S.K. Ranjnikar & Associates, who are appearing for the Applicant in the Interim Application seeking intervention in the present Petition, are absent. None represents the Applicant either in the Court hall or through the video conferencing mode.

2. There are several disputed aspects before us. The first prayer put forth by the Petitioner in the Writ Petition under Paragraph No.42, pertains to an application filed by the Petitioner, wherein Respondent No.2 is requested to reinstate the name of the Petitioner in the assessment record and assessment bill no.KE0702780160000.

3. The learned Advocate for the Corporation submits that the said application is pending. However, as there is a First Information Report (**'FIR'**) registered against the present Petitioner and who has also lodged a complaint against the Intervention Applicant, the Corporation is yet to decided the application.

4. The Police Authorities are at liberty to independently inquire into the complaint filed by the present Petitioner and

investigate the FIR in accordance with the provisions laid down in law, save and except, in the face of any legal impediment. Simultaneously, the Corporation can deal with the request of the Petitioner by considering the objections of all the stakeholders and by following the due procedure laid down in law, arrive at a conclusion with reasons. Let such conclusion be communicated to all the stakeholder. We make it clear that if the application of the present Petitioner is not in accordance with any specific provisions of law, the Corporation is at liberty to pass an appropriate order.

5. In view of the above, this **Writ Petition stands disposed off**.

6. The **Interim Application** seeking intervention, would not survive and also **stands disposed off**.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)