



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.797 OF 2026**

Anjaneya Dilip Patankar ... Petitioner
versus
Apex Grievance Redressal Committee and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. J.S.Kini with Mr. Aum Kini i/by Sapna Krishnappa, for Petitioner.

CORAM: N.J.JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 23 JANUARY 2026

ORAL ORDER:

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 29 May 2025 passed by the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee (R1) in Appeal No.38 of 2024, whereby the appeal preferred by the Petitioner against an order passed by the CEO, SRA, Pune, thereby permitting Respondent No.3 to implement the slum rehabilitation scheme on the Final Plot No.2/1, 2/4, 3/1, T.P.scheme No.1, Erandwane, Pune, came to be dismissed.
3. Mr. Kini, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, submitted that the Petitioner is a co-owner of the subject land which has been declared as the slum. The Petitioner claims through Ms. Anjaneya D. Patankar, daughter of Chandrakant, in whose favour, a decree in Civil Suit No.1786 of 1993 was passed alongwith his brother Vasant. After the demise of Chandrakant, in the year 2017, the names of the Petitioner and other heirs of Chandrakant have

been mutated to the record of rights of the subject property.

4. Mr. Kini submitted that, in the order passed by the CEO, SRA, the developer has been granted liberty to seek corrections in the record of rights of the subject property. Such a direction is beyond the remit of the jurisdiction of the CEO, SRA. The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee has not adverted to the said aspect of the matter though a specific objection was raised on behalf of the Petitioner.

5. Mr. Kini further submitted that, on the strength of the said observation, the developer has moved the revenue authority for correction in the record of rights of the subject property.

6. It appears that, after the demise of Chandrakant in the year 2007, the names of the legal heirs of Chandrakant came to be mutated to the record of rights to a portion of the property over which SR scheme is being implemented, in the year 2017. If the Petitioner claims proprietary title over the subject property, the Petitioner will have to approach the Civil Court seeking appropriate reliefs. The Petitioner may also assert preferential right to implement SR scheme over the portion of the declared slum in the capacity of the owners thereof, in the manner known to law.

7. Thus, the order permitting the Respondent No.3 to develop SR scheme, does not warrant any interference. However, it needs to be clarified that the directions by the CEO, SRA, that the Respondent No.3 – developer

shall get the record of rights of the subject property corrected, will not, by itself, confer any right on the Respondent No.3 – developer. To that extent, it is clarified that the said direction would not impinge upon the proprietary rights which the Petitioner may have over the subject property as a co-owner thereof. And, in the event, the Petitioner institutes a suit in vindication of his proprietary rights, the said observation would not bear upon adjudication of such suit.

8. Subject to the aforesaid clarification, the Writ Petition stands disposed.

(N.J.JAMADAR, J.)