AJIT RAMESH PATHRIKAR Digitally signed by AJIT RAMESH PATHRIKAR Date: 2026.10.09 13:53:03 +0530

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 5031 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 3459 OF 2025

Anupam Pinakinbhai Padaya ...Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

Mumbai International Airport Limited (MIAL) & Ors. ...Respondents

---

Mr. Anupam Padaya, Applicant in person, present.

Mr. Vikram Nankani, Senior Advocate, a/w Chirag Kamdar, Shoma Maitra, Suhas S. Kadu i/b Wadia Ghandy & Co. for Respondent.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
DR. NEELA GOKHALE, JJ.

DATE: 05th OCTOBER 2026

P.C.

1. At the outset, Mr. Anupam Padaya, Applicant-in-person, states that he is not pressing any of the allegations in the present proceedings against Respondent Nos.4 and 6 and does not wish to pursue the present proceedings against Respondent Nos.4 and 6. He, hence, seeks deletion of their names from the array of parties.

2. Permission, as sought for, is granted. The amendment be carried out forthwith. Re-verification is dispensed with.

3. In this view of the matter, none of the allegations made against Respondent Nos.4 and 6, which are the law firms, can be entertained.

4. On the aforesaid premise, we have taken this Interim Application for hearing.

Ajit Pathrikar

5. We have heard Mr. Anupam Padaya, Applicant-in-person and Mr. Vikram Nankani, learned Senior Advocate for Respondent No.1-Mumbai International Airport Limited (MIAL).

6. By this Interim Application, the Applicant-in-person seeks restoration of the Writ Petition, which came to be filed on **29th January 2025** and was dismissed for want of non-removal of office objections under Rule 986 of the Bombay High Court (Original Side) Rules, 1980, by an order dated 6th May 2026 passed by the Prothonotary and Senior Master of this Court.

7. There is a delay of 26 days in filing of this application. There are also other prayers which, in our opinion, are totally irrelevant to the relief sought for restoration, namely prayer clauses (c) (d) (e) and (f).

8. Having heard Mr. Anupam Padaya, Applicant-in-Person and having perused the memo of the application, and subject to the contentions of Mr. Nankani on behalf of Respondent No.1 intends to raise and on the premise that none of the allegations of the Applicant are admitted on behalf of Respondent No.1, considering that the Applicant is appearing in person, in the present proceedings and in the Writ Petition which was rejected for non-removal of office objections, we are inclined to restore the petition to the file of this Court by condoning the delay.

9. We expressly make it clear that we have not considered any of the contentions which are raised in the memo of the application or any of the allegations made in that regard, except considering simpliciter restoration of the Writ Petition to the file of this Court.

10. Accordingly, the Interim Application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b), keeping all contentions of the Respondents open, including the averments and statements made in the memo of the petition.

11. Disposed of in the aforesaid terms. No costs.

(DR. NEELA GOKHALE, J) (G. S. KULKARNI, J.)