

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION****REVIEW PETITION NO.16 OF 2025****IN****WRIT PETITION NO.3448 OF 2024**

Sunita Suresh Nandoskar & ors.

... Petitioners

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Karl Tamboly with Mr. Omar Khaiyam Shaikh for the Petitioners.

Ms. Gaurangi Patil, A.G.P. for the Respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Aseem Naphade with Mr. Saurabh Utangale i/by Mr. Rohan Sawant for the Respondent No.3.

**CORAM : A. S. GADKARI AND
KAMAL KHATA, JJ.**

DATE : 27th June 2025.

P.C. :

1) By the present Review Petition, the Petitioners are seeking review of judgment dated 31st January, 2025.

2) Heard Mr. Tamboly, learned counsel for the Petitioners, Ms. Gaurangi Patil, learned A.G.P. for the Respondent No.1/State and Mr. Aseem Naphade, learned counsel for the Respondent No.3. Perused record.

3) It is the contention of the learned counsel for the Petitioners

that the statement made by the learned counsel for the Respondent No.3-Developer, in Interim Application (L) No.13666 of 2024 in Writ Petition No.1088 of 2023 and Interim Application (L) No.13658 of 2024 in Writ Petition No.746 of 2023, as recorded in paragraph No.4 was in fact made in the connected application and has no relevance to the present Judgment. He submitted that, the Petitioners herein are no way concerned with the disbursement of the said amount as per their eligibility and therefore, the said paragraphs may be deleted from the judgment dated 31st January, 2025.

5) Mr. Naphade, learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No.3-Developer, fairly conceded to the said fact and also asserted that paragraph No.4 from the Judgment dated 31st January, 2025 needs to be deleted.

6) In view of the above, paragraph No.4 of the judgment dated 31st January, 2025 stands deleted from record.

7) As a consequence thereof, paragraph No.6 of the said judgment needs to be substituted as follows :

“Since the disputes between the parties are pending decision with MHADA, we see no reason to entertain a Contempt Petition.”

8) Review Petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent and in the aforesaid terms and is disposed off.

(KAMAL KHATA, J.)

(A.S. GADKARI, J.)