

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

**FIRST APPEAL NO. 631 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.9089 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16069 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 631 OF 2025**

Lokesh Ramnath Ramgude,
age : 55 years, Occupation : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.06-A, Building No.09,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 251 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1196 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 251 OF 2025**

Ashok Ramesh Bohat
age : 53 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,

Flat No.12-A, 1st Floor, Building No.9,
Indian Air Lines, 2nd Housing Colony,
Kalina, Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

...Respondents

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 250 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1195 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 250 OF 2025**

Bhimrao Mahadeo Chavan
age : 51 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.3/A, 1st floor, Building No.40,
Air India 1st Housing Colony,
[Old Air India Housing Colony], Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group

Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 254 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1201 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 254 OF 2025

Vinay Kumar Choudhary
age : 45 years, Occ: Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.12/C, 2nd Floor, Building No.2CC,
Eviction Case No.228 of 2023
Residence-Indian Air Lines, 2nd Housing Colony,
Kalina, Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 463 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16079 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 463 OF 2025

Sunita Ashok Gaikwad
age : 56 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,

Eviction Case No.75 of 2023
Flat No.29-B, Building No.04,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 472 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16072 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 472 OF 2025**

Avinash Bhimrao Sonawane
age : 53 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.09, Building No.15,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group

Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 462 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16076 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 462 OF 2025

Arun Shinde
age : 57 years, Occ: Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.24, Building No.03,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 460 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16070 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 460 OF 2025

Ranvir Ghogaliya
age : 55 years, Occ: Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No.50 of 2023

Flat No.1, Building No.1,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 471 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16068 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 471 OF 2025**

Vidyanand Jaiwantrao Chikhalikar
age : 47 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 48 of 2023
Flat No.11-B, Building No.15,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group

Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 632 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16078 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 632 OF 2025

Rakesh Gohain
age : 56 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 64 of 2023
Flat No.47, Building No.05,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 473 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16082 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 473 OF 2025

Suryakant C. Shikare
age : 50 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,

Eviction Case No. 74 of 2023
Flat No.06-A, Building No.09,
Old Air India Housing Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 464 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16083 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 464 OF 2025**

C. M. Sonawane
age : 56 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.25, Building No.16,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group

Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 469 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16075 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 469 OF 2025

Karnal Nersingrao
age : 60 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.8, Building No.20B,
Indian Air India Colony, Kalina,
Eviction Case No. 308 of 2023
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 475 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16074 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 475 OF 2025

Sunil Maruti Pote
age : 52 years, Occ: Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 57 of 2023

Flat No.108, Building NoA,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 474 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16081 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 474 OF 2025**

Bhupendra D. Worlikar
age : 56 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Flat No.08-A, Building No.1,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group

Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 465 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16073 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 465 OF 2025

S. P. Salunke
age : 57 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 259 of 2023
Flat No.2-A, Building No.06,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 470 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.16080 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 470 OF 2025

Harish Karbhari Deshmukh
age : 53 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,

Flat No.8, Building No.01,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 468 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.951 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 468 OF 2025**

Ravindra Dhondiba Gole
age : 55 years, Occ : Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 269 of 2023
Flat No.7-A, Building No.17,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali

Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 246 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.939 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 246 OF 2025

Brijendra Singh Bidlan
age : 55 years, Occ: Service in Air India Ltd.,
Eviction Case No. 240 of 2023
Flat No.7-A, Building No.02,
Old Air India Colony, Kalina,
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 253 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1200 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 253 OF 2025

S. L. Vanmala
age : 56 years, Occ: Air India Service,

Flat No.3-A, Building No.5, 1st Floor,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony, ...Appellant/
Kalina, Santacruz (East), Applicant
Mumbai – 400 029

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
 2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099
- ...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 245 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.981 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 245 OF 2025**

S. Raviraj Nayak
age : 53 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.11-A, Building No.44, 1st Floor,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony, ...Appellant/
Kalina, Santacruz (East), Applicant
Mumbai – 400 029

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali

Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 252 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1198 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 252 OF 2025

Arvind K. Jadhav
age : 55 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.3-A, Building No.3,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony,
Kalina, Santacruz (East),
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 244 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.980 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 244 OF 2025

K. K. Kohli

age : 48 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.8-A, Building No.5, 1st Floor,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony,
Kalina, Santacruz (East),
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 256 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION (STAMP) NO.37654 OF 2024
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 256 OF 2025**

Sudhakar N. Bhawar

age : 55 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.19-A, Building No.06,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony,
Kalina, Santacruz (East),
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 248 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.941 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 248 OF 2025

Rohini R. Vandakar
age : 42 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.1-B, Building No.44,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony,
Kalina, Santacruz (East),
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 249 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.1193 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 249 OF 2025

Ashok A. Kamble
age : 56 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.20-A, Building No.06,
Indian Airlines Colony, Kalina,
Santacruz (East), Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099
2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL NO. 247 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO.953 OF 2025
IN
FIRST APPEAL NO. 247 OF 2025**

S. R.Patil
age : 55 years, Occ: Air India Service,
Flat No.5-A, Building No.7,
Old/New/Air India/ Indian Airlines Old/New Colony,
Kalina, Santacruz (East),
Mumbai – 400 029

...Appellant/
Applicant

Versus

1. Airport Authority of India,
Through – Mr. Radhakrishna,
Eviction Officer Western Regional
Office New Airport Colony
Andheri Sahar Road, Mumbai-400 099

2. Mumbai International Airport Pvt. Ltd.,
Through-Mr. Jeetendra Prakash Sali
Representative of MIAL / Adani Group
Terminal 1B, 1st Floor, CSMIA,
Mumbai – 400 099

...Respondents

Mr. Kishor Dhoke i/b Mr. Nitin Satpute for the Appellants/Applicants in all matters

Ms. Shilpa Kapil for the Respondent No.1-AAI

Mr. Vikram Nankani, Senior Advocate i/b Wadia Ghandy and Co., for the Respondent No.2-Mumbai Airport.

CORAM : SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.
RESERVED ON : 2nd FEBRUARY, 2026
PRONOUNCED ON : 9th MARCH, 2026

JUDGMENT :

1. The present group of appeals is filed under Section 28-K of the Airports Authority of India Act, 1994 (for short, “**AAI Act**”), challenging the orders passed by the Eviction Officer under Section 28-B of the AAI Act directing the eviction of the Appellants from the subject airport premises.

2. The Appellants in the present appeals are identically situated as the Appellants in First Appeal No. 1843 of 2024 and connected appeals, which came to be dismissed vide judgment dated 15th July, 2025 passed by this Court upholding the individual eviction orders. The common judgment of 15th July, 2025 was challenged by way of SLP (C)

No 22724 of 2025, which was dismissed by the Hon'ble Apex Court vide order dated 30th November, 2025 and time was granted to handover vacant possession of the residential premises up to 30th November 2025 upon filing the undertaking to that effect with the Registrar of this Court.

3. The present group of appeals challenge identical eviction orders passed under the AAI Act by the Eviction Officers. With consent, First Appeal No. 631 of 2025 was taken as lead petition, and the facts of the said case are referred to for factual clarity.

4. Vide impugned order dated 14th November, 2024, the Eviction Officer, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 28-B(1) and (2) of the AAI Act, ordered eviction of the Appellant, who is an employee of Air India Airport Services Ltd. ("**AIASL**") and claims to be in authorized occupation of the airport premises. The eviction orders came to be passed upon the application filed by Respondent No. 1 contending that the Appellant is employee of AIASL and is unauthorised occupation of the airport premises. The application set out the dis-investment process, the decision to permit the Air India employees to stay in the residential colonies post disinvestment for a period of 6 months or till the property is monetized, whichever is earlier, the previous litigation between the parties and the orders

passed by Bombay High Court, Madras High Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court.

5. Upon arriving at a satisfaction that sufficient cause is made out, show cause notice dated 4th October 2023 was issued under the AAI Act to show cause as to why an order of eviction should not be passed. The response of the Respondent No.1 therein, who is the Appellant herein, was that the representative of all Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes Air India Employees had filed Criminal Writ Petition No. 5134 of 2022 before the Bombay High Court against illegal eviction, and a criminal complaint registered as M.A. SC/ST Case No. 1091 of 2023 against various persons, before the Hon'ble Special Court City Sessions Court, Mumbai established under Section 14(1) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (for short, "**SC/ST Act**"). The contention was that Section 15-A(8)(c) of the SC/ST Act restrained the Respondents from the act of eviction and that the Air India Employees had entered into an agreement with Respondent No. 2- AAI, for implementation of the reservation policies. The locus of Respondent No 1 was questioned and there was denial to the grounds of eviction.

6. The counter of the Respondent No. 1 *inter alia* stated that it is neither a party to the criminal writ petition nor to the criminal

complaint and that there are no orders granting stay to the present eviction proceedings.

7. The issues which were framed by the Eviction Officer reads as under:

- “(a) Whether Applicant can initiate Eviction proceedings under chapter V-A of the AAI Act 1994,
- (b) Whether the Ld. Eviction Officer has jurisdiction to try, entertain and decide the eviction proceedings initiated against Respondent No. 1,
- (c) Whether Respondent No. 1 proves that he/she is not in unauthorized occupation of the subject premises as described in the schedule of the Eviction Application filed by the Applicant ?
- (d) What Order?
- (e) What Costs?”

8. The issues were answered in favour of the Respondent No.1 herein, and eviction orders were passed. Hence, the present appeals.

9. Mr. Dhoke, learned Counsel appearing for the Appellant, would submit that the AAI carried out the project of alleged disinvestment of the airport site, Mumbai, through a tender floated in the year 2002–2003, in which G.V.K. Reddy was the lowest bidder, and an agreement was executed between the AAI and G.V.K. Reddy on 26th April 2006 for disinvestment of the airport site, which included the colony quarters.

He would submit that the Madras High Court had partially accepted the demand by the Union therein, of the reservation for SC/ST/OBC category employees in recruitment and promotion to be continued and had observed that the bidder is obligated to use best endeavour for the first year to provide adequate job opportunities to SC/ST persons. He would further submit that the employees belonging to the members of the SC/ST community filed interim application in the writ petition before this Court challenging the disinvestment alleging change of service rules, which came to be disposed of with liberty to the applicants to file a separate writ petition. He submits that thereafter, the Air Corporation SC/ST Employees Association filed Criminal Writ Petition No. 5134 of 2022, which is pending and it is during the pendency of the criminal writ petition, that recoveries were started against the employees, which led to filing of police complaint against the alleged illegal acts of the Secretary of Ministry of Civil Aviation (**'MOCA'**) and officers of Air India Ltd. He would submit that as there was inaction of police, the Air Corporation SC/ST Employees Association filed a criminal case against Secretary of MOCA and two officers of Air India Ltd., Mumbai, before the Hon'ble Special Court established under Section 14(1) of the SC/ST Act, and in the said proceeding, the AAI, MOCA through its Secretary, Air India Assets Holding Company, and Commissioner of Police, were made parties. He

submits that during the pendency of the criminal writ petition before this Court and the criminal complaint before the Special Court, the Respondent No.1- MIAL initiated eviction proceedings, by reason of which, application was filed against the Eviction Officer, the Senior Superintendent of Air India Ltd., and representative of MIAL. He further submits that the question which arises before the Special Court and the eviction proceedings is, as to who is the proper and valid Eviction Officer, under which Act i.e. PPE Act or AAI Act and as to whether the reservation policies applicable to members of the SC/ST employees are followed or not. He submits that the Eviction Officer has passed the final order, in which there is reference to Lease Deed Agreement dated 26th April 2006 and supplementary Lease Deed Agreement executed on 21st December 2012 i.e. alleged Lease Deeds are in the name of G.V.K. Reddy and not between AAI and Adani Group nor between MIAL and Adani Group. He would further submit that after final eviction orders were issued by Eviction Officer/AAI, MIAL sealed 27 quarters along with household articles of employees in their absence, and that some employees have thereafter vacated and some appeals were withdrawn. He submits that the Air Corporation SC/ST Employees Association has filed an application before the Special Court to call for certain records and documents, which were directed to be called for by the Special Court vide order dated 27th September

2024. He submits that the original and authenticated documents i.e. Lease Deeds of 2006 and 2012 along with the map of alleged disinvestment of Air India Airport, Mumbai, are required to be called for effective adjudication. He submits that the contention of the Respondent No. 1 is that they do not have these documents or that they are confidential documents.

10. Mr. Nankani, learned Senior Advocate appearing on behalf of the Respondent No. 2 would submit that the contentions raised by the Appellant in the present case are covered by the judgment dated 15th July 2025 and the additional issues raised in the present case are as regards the application of reservation policy. He submits that the Appellant was allotted the subject premises upon entering into a leave and license agreement in the form of an undertaking dated 21st August 2018 in accordance with the Air India Housing Allotment Rules. He draws attention of this Court to the Rules and submits that the Rules provide for the allotment by way of grant of license, and reservation policy is applicable only at the time of allotment. He submits that the housing colony lands were duly acquired by AAI and are airport premises within the meaning of Chapter V-A of the AAI Act. He submits that under OMDA, the Respondent No. 2 was obligated to ensure that the airport land was handed over free from encumbrances, and that

pursuant to the execution of OMDA, the Lease Deed of 2006 and the Supplementary Lease Deed of 2011 were executed, to which the master plan of the entire demised land and carved out assets was annexed. He submits that the housing colony lands were leased to MIAL by virtue of the said Lease Deeds and Supplementary Lease Deed, which makes specific reference to the housing colony lands.

11. He would further submit that contempt proceedings were filed before Sessions Court in pending Criminal Misc. Application being SC/ST No. 1901 of 2023, where neither the Eviction Officer nor representative of MIAL were originally made party to the criminal applications and the same has been dismissed by the Hon'ble Sessions Court vide order dated 2nd February 2024. He submits that the Sessions Court has held that the submission as regards the eviction notice being served to cause harassment and humiliation to member of the SC/ST community, is *prima facie* inconsiderable and unreliable and that the order passed by various forums are applicable to all the employees including SC/ST employees, who are not excluded in any manner. He submits that the Association has filed an application before the Hon'ble Sessions Court to restrain the implementation of the eviction orders passed by the Eviction Officer, which application has been rejected by the Sessions Court. He submits that the Hon'ble

Sessions Court has observed that the issue concerning accommodation has also been addressed by the High Court and the Apex Court and would apply to all employees, including those of the Association, and has therefore rejected the application. He submits that the finding of the Hon'ble Sessions Court is that no prohibitory order could be issued.

12. He would submit that insofar as the Interim Application filed by the Appellants are concerned, seeking production of the Lease Deed and Supplementary Lease Deed, an affidavit-in-reply has been filed clearly recording that notarized copy of the Lease Deed and Supplementary Lease Deed both executed between the AAI and MIAL are part of the eviction application. He would further submit that the provisions of the SC/ST Act do not apply as MIAL has taken action against all occupants without any discrimination and there is no caste based discriminatory action. He submits that the Appellants do not enjoy any special rights to continue in occupation on account of their status as SC/ST as contended and that the reservation policy applies only at the time of allotment. He submits that the Appellants are mere licensees and are bound to vacate upon determination of the license.

13. The points arising for determination :

- (a) Whether the eviction orders passed under the AAI Act deserves interference ?

(b) Whether the pendency of criminal proceedings would bar the eviction of the employees upon being found to be in unauthorised occupation ?

14. In the earlier group of Appeals, the Court framed the following points for determination:

- “1. Whether upon execution of OMDA on 4th April, 2006, the housing colony lands and the super structures constructed thereon were demised by Airports Authority of India in favour of Applicant under the Lease Deed dated 26th April, 2006 and Supplemental Lease deed dated 21st December, 2011?
2. Whether upon dis-investment of Air India Limited, the housing colony lands and/or the super structure stand transferred to AIAHCL?
3. Whether the residential accommodation constitutes Airport premises giving jurisdiction to the Eviction Officer under the AAI Act and not the Estate Officer under PPE Act?
4. Whether the license granted by Air India Limited to the employees in respect of the housing accommodation has been terminated by Air India Limited?
5. Whether the action of eviction could be initiated only at the instance of Air India/AIESEL and not by Applicant or Airports Authority of India?
6. Whether AIAHCL, Air India Limited/ AIESL/ AIATSL are necessary parties to the proceedings?

7. Whether Respondent No.1-employees are unauthorised occupants of the airport premises?

15. The findings on the issues were summarised in the concluding paragraph 67 of the judgment dated 15th July, 2025, as under:

“(a) The lands on which the housing colonies are located are owned by Airport Authority of India and constitute airport premises under Section 28-A of AAI Act.

(b) The lease hold rights in the housing colony lands stand transferred to Mumbai International Airport Ltd upon disinvestment of Air India Ltd. As the housing colonies constructed on the airport land yield to the lessor on disinvestment, the same constitutes airport premises. In any event AIAHCL has handed over the possession of the housing colonies to Mumbai International Airports Ltd.

(c) The housing accommodation facility advanced by Air India Ltd to its employees stood withdrawn and leave and license stood terminated and time was given by the Hon'ble Division Bench to vacate the premises by 24th September, 2022.

(d) No right in the housing colonies lands or the housing colonies remained with Air India Ltd upon disinvestment and no such right can be claimed by its employees.

(e) As the subject lands and housing colonies constitute airport premises and are required for purpose of airport, it is the AAI Act which will be applicable and not PPE Act.”

16. The findings of this Court passed in respect of identically situated employees vide judgment dated 15th July, 2025 have attained finality upon dismissal of SLP by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Mr. Dhoke has raised the issue of jurisdiction of the Eviction Officer, the locus of Respondent No. 2-MIAL to initiate eviction proceedings and the premises not being airport premises, which issues stand concluded by the judgment dated 15th July, 2025. As this Court has already upheld the jurisdiction of Eviction officer, the locus of MIAL and the premises being airport premises, the same findings cover the issues in present case as it is not shown that the employees situated herein are not identically situated.

17. The additional contentions raised in the present group of Appeals is as regards the impact of the status of the Appellants as members of the SC/ST community on the eviction proceedings and the eviction orders are claimed to be in violation of the rights of the Appellants who belong to SC/ST status. The right to continue in the residential accommodation is premised broadly on (a) order of Madras High Court which partially accepted the demand of reservation of SC/ST/OBC category employees in recruitment and promotion (b) the pendency of Criminal Writ Petition No 5134 of 2022, Criminal M.A. SC&ST/ 1091 of 2023, contempt application under Section 15A(8) (c) of

SC/ST Act, and, (c) reservation policy under Article 16(4) of Constitution of India.

18. The Eviction Officer has considered the submissions on the applicability of SC/ST Act and has recorded its findings in paragraph 42, 45 and 46 as under:

"42. I have noted Mr. Dhokes submissions on the SC/ST POA Act. Section 3(1)(z) of the SC/ST POA Act provides that any person who "forces or causes a member of Schedule Caste or a Schedule Tribe to leave his house, village or other place of residence" shall be punishable with imprisonment or fine as set out in the SC/ST POA Act. In the present case, the premises in question were allotted to Respondent No. 1 on license basis by his employer i.e. Air India by virtue of his employment. As such, Respondent No. 1 does not have any separate or exclusive right in respect of the subject Airport Premises and at best can claim only through Air India. The Government of India in the AISAM decision dated 29th September, 2021 which was communicated to all employees called upon all employees to vacate the housing colony accommodations within 6 months of disinvestment. At this stage no special provision was made in respect of employees belonging to the SC/ST Community. Upon its disinvestment Air India's right in the Housing Colonies stood extinguished. Air India's decision to call upon employees to vacate the housing colony accommodations was challenged by various Unions before the Hon'ble Madras High Court as well as the Hon'ble Bombay High Court. All these orders have been placed on record and have been perused by me. None of these orders make any exception in respect of employees belonging to SC/ST community. This being the case, I am inclined to dismiss the Representation made by Respondent No. 1 that the eviction application should be rejected or kept in abeyance till the hearing

of various criminal proceedings filed by one Air Corporation Employees Association.

45. Notably Respondent No. I had filed an application under Section 15A(8)(c) for ad interim relief against the Respondents therein and Contemnors for restraining them with interfering in any related or unrelated pending matters without prior permission of the special court and for initiating the contempt proceeding against the Respondents therein and Contemnors. The Respondent No. I claims that this office was also impleaded as a Contemnor though no papers and proceedings have been served on this office. The Hon'ble Sessions Court by an Order dated 2nd February, 2024 rejected the contempt petition as being devoid of merits. The Hon'ble Court held that the submission of complainant that they being members of SC and ST, and that the eviction notices are served with an intention to cause harassment and humiliation to them, are prima-facie inconsiderable, unappreciable and unreliable. The Hon'ble Court held that the members of SC ST shall not have a separate and independent distinct status to have the relief sought by them and the orders passed by various forums are applicable to all the employees including the SC/ST employees who were not excluded in any manner.

46. The Applicant has followed due process of law by initiating proceedings under Chapter V-A of the AAI Act. After issuance of Show Cause Notice ample opportunity was granted to the Respondent No. 1 to file submissions and advance arguments. Respondent No. I has availed of this opportunity and filed submissions which have been duly considered. Therefore, the allegation that there has been any violation of the Constitution of India is unfounded and is rejected."

19. It is not disputed that the allotment of accommodation was under the Air India Housing Allotment Rules, 2017, which Rules are

framed for allotment of company residence by Air India. Rule 5 dealing with the procedure for allotment provides that in case of housing colony allotment, a list will be drawn up calling for options from amongst eligible permanent employees and the employees will be offered flats as per their turn in the list. Rule 6 which deals with reservation in the allotment of quarters for SC/ST employees provides for percentage of reservation in the specific types of flats. The Rules would indicate that at the time of allotment of quarters, certain percentage in specified types of flats were reserved for SC/ST employees, who got preferential allotment. The said Rule cannot be stretched to mean that once the residential accommodation is allotted to SC/ST employees out of the reserved flats, irrespective of whether the license stands terminated or whether Air India Ltd itself stood divested of any right in the residential accommodation, the allotment continues in perpetuity by reason of reservation of flats and the SC/ST employee cannot be evicted even upon termination of the leave and license agreement. Rule 20 provides that the allottees to whom residence are allotted are only licensees. The Rules makes it evident that the reservation criteria applied at the time of allotment of the residential accommodation and upon termination of the leave and license agreement, all employees who accepted the residential accommodation under the leave and license agreement are bound to

vacate the premises. No right accrues to SC/ST employee in the residential premises upon termination of leave and license agreement under which allotment was made.

20. The reliance of Mr. Dhoke on the directions of the Madras High Court in Writ Petition No 25568 of 2021 is clearly misplaced. The direction of Madras High Court was in context of the demand raised for reservation for SC/ST/OBC category employees in recruitment and promotion and refers to the job opportunities. The direction cannot be read to mean reservation and continued extension of the housing accommodation to the employees of Air India who belong to the SC/ST category.

21. As far as the pendency of criminal proceedings before this Court and Sessions Court is concerned, the proceedings will take its own course and does not impact the eviction orders passed under the AAI Act. The copy of the Criminal Writ Petition No 5134 of 2022 is not placed on record and search of the official website of the Court indicates that the Petition was dismissed for non prosecution. Having upheld the jurisdiction of the Eviction Officer under the AAI Act, the pendency of the criminal proceedings is immaterial consideration while deciding the validity of the eviction order. Even considering the Sessions Court proceedings, Mr. Nankani has placed on record the

order dated 2nd February, 2024 passed by the Hon'ble Sessions Court in application below Exhibit 5 in Criminal M.A. SC/ST No. 1091 of 2022, which application was filed during the pendency of the eviction proceedings. The Hon'ble Sessions Court considered the provisions of the SC/ST Act as well as the past litigation and orders passed by this Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court. It held that merely relying on the provisions of Section 15-A(8)(c) of the SC/ST Act is inconsiderable and inappreciable. It noted that the issue is concerning all the employees and the SC/ST members have not been externed or excluded in any manner and rejected the interim application. Subsequently, the eviction orders came to be passed pursuant to which another application was filed before the Sessions Court below Exhibit 37 under Section 15-A(8)(c) of the SC/ST Act for the purpose of restraint against the implementation of the final orders of eviction. The Hon'ble Special Court declined to grant any prohibitory relief and dismissed and disposed of the application. The Appellant made another attempt before the Sessions Court to prohibit execution of the eviction proceeding without permission of the Sessions Court. Vide order dated 25th October, 2024, the Sessions Court rejected the application. The orders of the Hon'ble Sessions Court would indicate that the Sessions Court has taken into consideration the fact that it is not only the employees belonging to the SC/ST Caste who have been subjected to

the orders of eviction and that the same are passed against all the employees. The dismissal of the application would itself indicate the non-applicability of the provisions of the SC/ST Act in the facts and circumstances of the present case. The order of Sessions Court is not shown to have been challenged further. No assistance can, therefore, be drawn by the Appellants from the provisions of the SC/ST Act.

22. The Appellants seeks to rely on the provisions of Section 3(1)(z) of the SC/ST Act, to counter the eviction proceedings. Section 3 of the SC/ST Act provides for punishment for offences for atrocities and Section 3(1)(z) provides that forcing or causing a member of Schedule Caste or a Schedule Tribe to leave his house, village or other place of residence constitutes an offence. According to Appellant, by reason of Section 3(1)(z), even after eviction orders are passed after following due procedure of law, the SC/ST employees cannot be evicted from their residence. The contention proceeds on complete misreading of the said provision. The action of eviction being an action taken in accordance with law cannot constitute an offence under Section 3(1)(z) of SC/ST Act. Accepting the contention would lead to a consequence that no member of SC/ST can ever be evicted from the premises occupied by it, whether tenanted or owned or allotted even in accordance with the procedure known to law. The same cannot be said

to be the import of Section 3(1)(z) of the SC/ST Act. The action of eviction is initiated against all employees of Air India Ltd after the disinvestment process without any discrimination and would not amount to an offence committed against an employee by reason of his/her caste. The Appellant being licensee are bound to vacate upon termination of their license and no special rights accrue to the Appellant by reason of their status as SC/ST.

23. Under Article 16(4) of Constitution of India, the State may make provision for the reservation of appointments or posts in any backward class of citizens, which in the opinion of State, is not adequately represented in the services under the State. The reservation under Article 16(4) has no relevance to the present case where after the disinvestment process, the leave and license stands terminated and the employees are required to vacate the allotted premises.

24. The decision to evict the Appellant is assailed as breach of SC/ST Act. The said contention is devoid of merits. The action is taken against all occupants of residential colonies without any discrimination. It is not shown that the occupants belonging to SC/ST have been selectively targeted. There is no question of the eviction orders being in breach of SC/ST Act, which orders are passed after due process of law. The caste of the Appellant is irrelevant in present context, where

all occupants are similarly situated as licensees of the residential accommodation. The termination of the license's amounts to all occupants being rendered unauthorised occupants.

25. The other submission raised is that the Special Court vide order dated 27th September 2024 has directed the Respondents to produce the authenticated copy of the documents which has not been complied with. The directions by the Special Court has no bearing to the facts of present case which pertains to the validity of the eviction orders. In the present First Appeal, an Interim Application has been filed in directing the respondents to produce the Lease Deeds of 2006 and 2011 along with copy of alleged disinvestment of Air India Airport. These documents were already placed on record before the Eviction Officer and has been considered by this Court in the judgment dated 15th July 2025. This Court has considered the various clauses of OMDA dated 4th April 2006, the Lease Deed dated 26th April 2006 and the Supplementary Lease Deed dated 21st December 2011. It is contended by the respondent No.2 that these documents pertaining to the privatization of Mumbai Airport are available on MOCA Website and there was no inspection of the original papers sought by the Appellants. The contention that the agreements were not produced is completely devoid of merits.

26. In light of the above findings, the Appeals are without merit and stand dismissed. Interim Applications do not survive for consideration and stand disposed of. Time of four weeks is granted to the Appellants to vacate their respective premises.

SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.