

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4836 OF 2025

Vijay Namdev Gujar

...Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra,
Department Of Housing & Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Abhinav Bhatkar i/b Kavita Narvekar for Petitioner.

Ms. Vrushali Kabre, AGP for State.

Adv. P. H. Kanthari for SRA Respondent Nos. 2 to 6.

Mr. Shakeeb Shaikh a/w Ms. Afreen Thanevala i/b Vis Legis Law Practice -
Respondent No.9.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
AARTI SATHE, JJ.
DATE: 24 DECEMBER 2025.

P.C.

1. In pursuance of our order dated 23 December 2025, the proceedings are listed today for an affidavit of disclosure of the movable and immovable assets of respondent No.9 who is surprisingly the sole proprietor undertaking large construction activities of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme, subject matter of the present petition.

2. In the light of what is being discussed hereafter has shocked our conscience which is to the effect that a developer like respondent No.9 who has hardly any amounts in his bank accounts and who sold 531 residential and commercial flats (1BHK, 2BHK and Commercial premises) in Mumbai has hardly any financial position in the bank account. This more particularly, when the affidavit shows that he still undertaking some SRA projects. Even an employee in the subordinate

Government Services would have a better financial standing in the bank accounts. Thus, respondent No.9 who has labeled himself to be a developer appears to have in some manner snatched the projects which are infact being executed by unknown third parties. The SRA is not aware about anything to this effect being kept in dark or otherwise which we do not know. Further discussion would through more light.

3. A brazenly dishonest affidavit is filed titled as "affidavit of disclosure" by one Mr. Pravin Viram Satra, who describes himself as the proprietor of respondent No.9. He has disclosed that he has six bank accounts in which the amounts are so meagre that we are afraid to even presume that respondent no.9 can at all be called a developer. There are several other properties which are disclosed in paragraph No.7 of such disclosure affidavit.

4. However, what has truly intrigued us is the disclosure in 'Annexure - B', in which 531 properties (flats), consisting of two bed-rooms, hall-kitchen and one-bedroom hall-kitchen flats, are stated to be sold and as to, in which of the bank accounts of respondent No.9, the proceeds of such sale have been received has also not been disclosed. It is for such reason, the affidavit is not a complete and honest disclosure.

5. In these circumstances, certainly for filing a false affidavit proceedings would be required to be initiated against Mr. Pravin Viram Satra, who has described himself to be the sole proprietor of respondent No.9 and who has involved himself in dealing with such large flats about 531 in number, in respect

of the project. He also appears to have different SRA projects as clearly recorded by us in our order dated 23 December 2025.

6. We had expressed serious doubts about the credentials of respondent No.9, who appears to be running the show as a sole proprietor and more particularly about the nature of the case sought to be put up before the Court, in the context of a very large amounts of money being outstanding transit rent. The intentions seems to be only to litigate at the cost of poor slum dwellers, for whom the transit rent, as held by us, is a right to shelter, which is an integral part of Article 21 of the Constitution.

7. In the aforesaid circumstances, while reserving further appropriate orders to be passed, including to initiate purgery proceedings, if so necessary, we direct that a further appropriate affidavit be filed by respondent No.9 disclosing the manner in which amounts are received from the sale of 531 residential and commercial tenements as also describing the trade value of the movables.

8. We also have serious doubt from the disclosure as to the credentials, of respondent No.9. Our apprehension is that there is much to be said about respondent No.9, as he appears to be merely a front, and in fact the persons undertaking the slum redevelopment project *ex facie* appears to be some third parties whether any fraud as being played on the SRA is the question. In this regard, the SRA needs to be extremely vigilant and take appropriate actions, including examining whether respondent No.9 is involved in any other SRA projects.

9. In the aforesaid circumstances, in respect of the properties, the details of which are set out in paragraph No.7 of the affidavit, we appoint the Court Receiver, High Court, Bombay, as Receiver of the said properties, with liberty to any parties who may be aggrieved to approach this Court in the present proceedings for vacating of such orders. Respondent No.9 is directed to deposit an amount of Rs. 5,00,000/- with Court Receiver towards initial charges. The Court Receiver, High Court, Bombay, is directed to forthwith take appropriate action.

10. Insofar as the properties which are ongoing SRA projects, we direct the Chief Officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority to undertake an inquiry and examine the appointment of respondent No.9 in relation to such projects, irrespective of whether they are in Mumbai or at Thane, and an appropriate report in that regard, as to whether respondent No.9 is genuinely undertaking such projects and as to who are the third parties behind the said project be placed before the Court. Let this exercise be undertaken on or before the adjourned date of hearing.

11. We also clarify that if the SRA is of the opinion that there is some fraud which is played on the Government Authorities, including the SRA, by respondent No.9, the Chief Executive Officer is free to lodge a criminal complaint under the appropriate provisions of the law.

12. We may also observe that all very serious issues have come to light on the Court passing the earlier orders directing disclosure affidavits to be placed on record.

13. We direct the Chief Executive Officer of the SRA to personally look into the affidavit of disclosure which is placed on record and also served on behalf of respondent No.9 on the advocate for the respondent No.9, and also take an expert opinion from a Chartered Accountant, so as to come to a conclusion whether respondent No.9 can at all be accepted as a developer in respect of any SRA project. This would be certainly in the interest of the slum dwellers as also the prospective flat purchasers in any free-sale building which may be constructed by respondent No.9.

14. The fate of the second affidavit which is filed by one Darshan Pravin Satra who is the son of the proprietor – respondent No.9 is also not different. In paragraph No.4 thereof, the said deponent, has also failed to set out any details.

15. The amount with the office of the Court Receiver be deposited by 27 December 2025. In the meantime, none of the properties as described in paragraph No.5 of the affidavit filed by Mr. Pravin Satra shall be dealt in any manner whatsoever, or any third party rights be created. The Court Receiver shall place his report on record on the adjourned date of hearing.

16. Parties to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

17. Let the further disclosure affidavit be served on the advocate for the petitioner as also the advocate for the SRA on or before Monday i.e. 29 December 2025. List the proceedings before the learned Vacation Judge for compliance on 29 December 2025.

18. Also the income tax returns for the last four years are stated to be submitted in a sealed envelop. We direct the Prothonotary and Senior Master of this Court to confidentially seek opinion of the financial standing and credentials of respondent No.9 by obtaining an expert opinion from the Chartered Accountant.

19. Let such report, in a sealed cover, be placed before us on the adjourned date of hearing.

20. Stand over to **9 January 2026 (FOB)**.

(AARTI SATHE, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)