

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 6932 OF 2025

Sanjay Dattatraya Kamble ...Petitioner

**Versus**

The Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Vinod Sangvikar, for the Petitioner.

Ms. Savina Crasto, APP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATED : 16<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2026

**ORAL ORDER:**

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.
2. The challenge in this petition is to an order dated 03<sup>rd</sup> February, 2025 passed by the AGRC in Appeal No. 159/2023, whereby the appeal preferred by the petitioner against an order dated 27<sup>th</sup> September, 2023 passed by the Additional Collector and Appellate Authority, rejecting the Appeal No. 1751/2018 preferred by the petitioner, came to be dismissed.
3. In the Annexure - II, the names of the petitioner and his brother Mahadev Dattatraya Kamble were entered at Item 16. The claim of the petitioner is that, the name of Mahadev Dattatraya Kamble, Respondent No. 4, was inadvertently inserted though the Respondent No. 4 has no concern with the

said structure, in lieu of which a tenament has been allotted, under the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme.

4. In addition to the documents which show that, the petitioner has been in the exclusive possession of the said structure, the petitioner placed reliance on an affidavit purportedly affirmed by the Respondent No. 4, whereby the Respondent No. 4 relinquished his right, title and interest in the said structure.

5. Before the Appellate Authority, the Respondent No. 4 affirmed that he was forced to execute the said affidavit.

6. The authorities have recorded that, in the survey the petitioner and Respondent No. 4 – brothers, were found in the occupation of the said structure and, therefore, their names were included in the Annexure-II.

7. It is suffice to note that, the fact that the petitioner banked upon an affidavit under which the Respondent No. 4 purportedly relinquished his right, title and interest in the said structure, speaks volumes about the interest of Respondent No. 4 in the said structure. The authorities have thus taken a correct view of the matter. No interference is warranted in the exercise of supervisory jurisdiction.

8. The petition stands dismissed.

[N. J. JAMADAR, J.]