

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 3503 OF 2025

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION NO.

Rajesh Ashok Devlekar & Ors.

... Petitioners

Versus

Municipal Corporation of
Greater Mumbai, Through Its
Commissioner & Ors.

... Respondents

WITH

INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO.29955 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 3503 OF 2025

Crestline Developer LLP.,

... Applicant

Versus

Municipal Corporation of
Greater Mumbai, Through Its
Commissioner & Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Vasantkumar Takke, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Ms. Rupali Adhate i/b Ms. Komal Punjabi, Advocates for Respondent-BMC.

Mr. Salunke - Mahadeo – Administrative Officer (Estate Dept. - present in Court.

Mr. Santosh Nachnekar-Head Clerk (Estate Dept.-present in Court).

Mr. Madhura Deshmukh, AGP for Respondent-State.

Mr. Mangirish Saraf i/b LJ Law, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 & 3.

Mr. R. R. Trishra a/w Mr. Rakesh Tripathi, Advocates for Respondent No.4.

Mr. Sanjiv Sawant a/w Mr. Samir Suryawanshi & Ms. Bhakti W. i/b Mr. Samir Suryawanshi, Advocate for Intervener in IA(L) No. 29955 of 2025.

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

DATE : 19th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :

1. Interim Application (I) No. 29955 of 2025, was not on board. Taken on board.
2. The Petitioners have assailed the approval granted by Respondent No.1 to Respondent No.2, for the redevelopment of the property.
3. According to the Petitioners and the Interveners, who have tendered an Intervention Application, Respondent No.1 has allegedly surreptitiously granted the approval to Respondent No.2.
4. The learned Advocate representing Respondent Nos.2 & 3 submits that neither any secrecy was maintained in the matter, nor was the procedure opaque. In a transparent way, the approval has been granted.
5. The Petitioners have issued a legal notice to the Corporation through a lawyer's firm. Such a legal notice cannot be construed as a representation made by an aggrieved party to the Corporation.

6. The Petitioners as well as the Intervenors submit that they would be making their representations to the Corporation within a period of one week.

7. The learned Advocate for the Corporation submits that if such representations are tendered, the Appropriate Officer deputed by Respondent No.1 would grant a reasonable opportunity of hearing to all the stakeholders and after considering the respective stands and grievances, an appropriate decision with reasons would be arrived at.

8. In view of the above statements having been recorded, **this Petition is disposed off.**

9. The learned Advocate for the Corporation submitted that a scrutiny of the claims of the tenants and due verification of the documents / consent, would be initiated from 25th September, 2025. We find that the said exercise could be taken forward and could be concluded. We direct that, the Corporation would neither disclose its decision in the light of such exercise, nor would formalize the claims of any person, until the grievances of the representatives or grievances voiced in the representations, are dealt with.

10. We make it clear that those who do not file the representations within 7 days, would be precluded from making such representations, thereafter. On the presumption that the representations would be filed on or before **26th September, 2025**, the Appropriate Officer deputed by Respondent No.1 would arrange for a hearing on the representations starting from **1st October, 2025** at 11.30 a.m. in his office.

11. If the hearing is not concluded, the next date of hearing would be fixed on the same day. The hearing would be completed by **8th October, 2025** and a reasoned order would be passed by the Corporation on or before **18th October, 2025**. The decision would be pronounced to all the parties.

12. Having recorded the above statements and the directions issued, **the Writ Petition and Intervention Application are disposed off.**

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)