

Digitally signed
by URMILA
PRAMOD
INGALE
Date:
2026.04.23
18:44:00
+0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 4552 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 10421 OF 2025**

Shamrao Narayan Nevase

since deceased through legal heirs

1.1. Smt. Vijaya Shamrao Nevase and ors. ... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and ors. Respondents

Mr. Nitin Gaware-Patil Mr. Divyesh K. Jain, for the petitioners.

Mr. M.P. Thakur, AGP for the respondent no.1.

Mr. Prakhar Tandon a/w Yashi Bhatt i/b Ms. Ravleen Sabharwal,
for respondent no.2-SRA.

Mr. Shashikant Surana i/b Mr. Madhur Surana, for respondent
no.3.

**CORAM : M. S. KARNIK &
S. M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 23rd APRIL, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners. The challenge in this petition is to the clubbing of 2 Schemes in respect of which learned counsel for the petitioners urged several illegalities. It is submitted that though several representations have been made to the respondent no.2- Chief Executive Officer, Slum Rehabilitation Authority ('SRA', for short) to decide objections/representations

dated 15/09/2021, 09/03/2023, 04/09/2024 and 18/12/2024 submitted by the petitioners before granting any approval to the proposal for implementation of SRA Scheme on the subject property i.e. Survey No. 8, Hissa No. 2, CTS No. 834 situated at Kanjur Village admeasuring 1100 sq. yards, respondent no.2 has failed to consider these proposals.

2. We have heard learned counsel for the respondents. So far as the aforementioned representations are concerned, since it is the grievance of the petitioners that there are several illegalities in the clubbing of the Schemes, respondent no.2- SRA, Chief Executive Officer is directed to look into the representations and take decision/action on the same in accordance with law.

3. As regards the grievance of the petitioners that the clubbing of the Schemes has resulted in the improper grant of the LOI, the said aspect can always be examined by the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee ('AGRC', for short) under Section 35(1A) of the Maharashtra Slum Areas (Improvement, Clearance and Redevelopment) Act, 1971. Having regard to the facts narrated by the petitioners and contentions raised, in our considered view, it

would be appropriate if an appeal before the AGRC is filed against the grant of LOI. If such an appeal is preferred before the AGRC within a period of 2 weeks from today, the respondents shall not raise an objection of limitation.

4. The AGRC to consider the appeal on its own merits and in accordance with law expeditiously. If an application for stay is preferred since the petitioners contend that there is threat of demolition, we request the AGRC to hear interim application on its own merits expeditiously.

5. Keeping all contentions open, the writ petition is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)