



IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW) NO. 1 of 2026 (F)
IN
PIL WRIT PETITION NO. 2020 OF 2025

Goa Bachao Abhiyan Rep. Its Convenor .. Applicants
Dr. Sabina Martins

Versus

The State of Goa, through its Chief .. Respondents
Secretary and five others

WITH
MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 194 of 2026 (F)
IN
CIVIL APPLICATION (REVIEW) NO.1 of 2026

M/s. Parmesh Constructions Co. Ltd .. Applicant
through its Authorised Representative

Versus

Goa Bachao Abhiyan Rep. Its Convenor .. Respondents
Dr. Sabina Martins

...

Adv. Nigel Da Costa Frias with Mr. Shane Coutinho, Mr. Vineet Surlakar, Adv. Maria Fernandes for the applicant.

Adv. M. Correia h/f Adv. S. Priolkar, AGA for Respondent nos. 1 and 2

Adv. Pai Nikhil Deelip for Respondent no.3 with Adv. A. Nagi through V.C.

Adv. Neelesh Takkekar with Adv. Vidhi Volvoikar for Respondent no.4.

Adv. Sinai Nadkarni Gauravvardhan Atmaram for Respondent no.5.

CORAM : BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA MEHTA, JJ
DATED : 27th APRIL, 2026

P.C:-

1 The Review Petition is filed raising a challenge to the judgment and order dated 14/11/2025 by setting out the following grounds in specific:-

(a) The judgment dated 14/11/2025 requires a review as this Hon'ble Court has failed to consider a material ground raised by the petitioners that the development permission dated 02/02/2024 issued to the respondent no.5 is invalid as it has not been granted by the MPDA in accordance with Section 44 of the Goa Town and Country Planning Act, 1974.

Apart from this, there are other grounds which are also raised and it is one of the ground that nothing in the record of MPDA reflect that there was consideration of the proposal of respondent no.5 while the approval is granted.

2 On hearing learned counsel Mr. Costa Frias, for the review petitioner, we must only observe that as far as ground (a) mentioned above, it is not imperative for the Court to consider every ground raised in the petition nor is it necessary that every contention raised, shall be reflected. While pronouncing our judgment of 14/11/2025, we have broadly considered the grounds raised by the NGO, Goa Bachao Abhiyan, in support of the relief of setting aside the permissions granted by the Respondent authorities in favour of respondent no.5, for the project in question, and when the petitioner sought quashing and setting aside the NOC/permission dated 30/6/2025, on due deliberation of the grounds and by taking into consideration, the other grounds raised in the accompanying PIL, the judgment has exhaustively considered the precise objection of respondent no.5 not

securing the necessary permissions.

3 All the grounds raised in the petition, raising opposition to the project of respondent no.5 were duly considered with reference to the meetings of the Committee as well as the statements filed on record, with minute details. Merely because one of the ground is raised and not considered definitely, cannot be a ground of review as on hearing the learned Advocate General, Mr. Pai appearing for respondent no.3 and Mr.Nadkarni representing respondent no.5, we have recorded that the technical objections raised by the petitioners are unfounded and not substantiated by any concrete material placed on record. In fact, the technical flaws alleged to be pressed into service that there is violation of the building Regulations 2010, as well as the provision of the Statute, was not sufficient to impinge upon the permissions granted by the competent authority.

Similarly, we have also gone into great details in looking into the aspect of discrepancy pointed out by the petitioners into the computation of slope levels and upon consideration of the rival submissions, we have concluded that the contour plans are based and prepared on surveys carried out on loco, with a total station survey, which hold within it 90 to 95% accuracy level compared to the survey of India Topographical sheets.

4 In the light of the above, since we find no ground which

would reflect an error apparent on the face or record which would justify exercising our power under review jurisdiction, we dismiss the Review Petition.

(NIVEDITA MEHTA, J)

(BHARATI DANGRE, J.)