

Amberkar

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

APPEAL FROM ORDER NO. 232 OF 2025
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 7238 OF 2025

Shweta Arun Sathe

Appellant

.. (Org. Plaintiff)

Versus

The Mumbai Municipal Corporation of Greater
Mumbai & Anr.

Respondents

.. (Org. Defendants)

.....

- Mr. Mohit Jadhav Advocate for Appellant
- Mr. Sachin Vajale, Advocate for Respondent No. 1
- Mr. Joel Carlos a/w Mr. Rohit Pandey, Ms. Afreen Khan & Mr. Dhiraj Tiwari , Advocate for Respondent No. 2

.....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : MAY 8, 2026

P. C.:

1. Not on board. Mentioned by way of filing a praecipe dated 08.05.2026.
2. Heard Mr. Jadhav, learned Advocate for Appellant; Mr. Vajale, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 1 - Corporation and Mr. Carlos, learned Advocate for Respondent No. 2.
3. Praecipe is filed by the Appellant seeking extension of time by one one week to register PAAA and to handover possession of the suit structure. Praecipe itself is faulty on the face of record. Despite specific directions given by court which are published in the High Court Website pertaining to the notice issued by this Court for filing

appropriate and correct praecipe, an innocuous praecipe is filed without giving reasons and merely mentioning that extension of time is required without specifying urgency which is not a correct procedure.

4. Developer is represented by Mr. Carlos. He has placed before me copies of the Demand Drafts dated 22.04.2026 which are required to be handed over to the Appellant. Said Demand Drafts are prepared and kept ready and despite the Appellant having been called upon repeatedly, he would submit that Appellant is playing truant and not collecting the Demand Drafts. That apart he would submit that Developer has taken a token for registration of PAAA for the last one week and on a daily basis has called the Appellant to come and present herself for execution and registration of PAAA, but the Appellant is not coming to the Registrar's Office.

5. Today Mr. Jadhav would submit that Appellant had certain reasons not to attend the Registrar Office and in that background, he would submit that the period of handing over of the property be extended.

6. The reasons which are mentioned in the order dated 23.04.2026 are extremely serious and critical. Several obligations which are required to be followed by the Developer are complied with but it

appears that Appellant is playing truant and not coming clean with the Court. Conduct of the Appellant does not inspire any confidence of the Court at all. Therefore I am not inclined to accept the reason given by Mr. Jadhav. Order dated 23.04.2026 shall stand as it is and shall be implemented as it is. Needless to state that the Appellant can register PAAA and accept the Demand Drafts as directed in the said order.

7. Praecipe is rejected.

Amberkar

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR
Digitally signed
by RAVINDRA
MOHAN
AMBERKAR
Date:
2026.05.08
20:51:08 +0530