

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4550 OF 2025

P. V. Surendran ... Petitioner

Versus

The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1166 OF 2026

Allwyn Gilbert Monteiro ... Petitioner

Versus

The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 4971 OF 2025

Sebastian Augustin Fernandes ... Petitioner

Versus

The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1149 OF 2026

Vibha Sarvesh Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 1147 OF 2026

Santana Adolf Pinto ... Petitioner

Versus

The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors. ... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 4515 OF 2025**

Robert Felix Dmello	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 841 OF 2026**

Harcharan Singh Harjit Singh Hanjara	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 837 OF 2026**

Supriya Ravindra Yerram	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 361 OF 2026**

Anthony Augustin Fernandes	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1158 OF 2026**

Rahim Abdul Jalil through POA Holder Atif Rahim Shaikh	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1148 OF 2026**

Damodar Annu Poojary	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 910 OF 2026**

Supriya Subhash More	... Petitioner
<u>Versus</u>	
The Apex Grievance Redressal Committee & Ors.	... Respondents

Mr. Chandrakant Yadav for the Petitioners.
Mr. Anoop Patil for Respondent No.1-AGRC.
Ms. Ravleen Sabharwal a/w. Ms. Aarushi Yadav for the Respondent-SRA.
Mr. Fakhruddin Khan i/b Ajaz Ahmed Ansari for Respondent No.5.

**CORAM : M. S. KARNIK AND
S. M. MODAK, JJ.**
DATED : 30th APRIL, 2026.

P.C. :

1. These petitions involve common questions, hence by consent of parties taken up for final disposal by a common order. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the Slum Rehabilitation Authority and learned counsel for respondent No.5.
2. Respondent No.5 is the complainant. Respondent No.5 says that the petitioners are illegal occupants of the SRA flats. SRA therefore initiated

proceedings for eviction. The case of the petitioners is that now they are in lawful occupation of the premises since there is an Order of regularisation in their favour. This is not denied by learned counsel for the SRA.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.5 invited our attention to Order dated 6th November, 2025 passed by this Court. The Order relied is not concerned with the present petitions and is in a different case altogether.

The Order reads thus:-

“1. In the light of the order dated 06 October, 2025, an action which was required to be taken by the SRA in pursuance thereto and more particularly as observed in paragraph 5 thereof, we are informed by Mr. Sawant, learned counsel for the petitioner that instead of the action of eviction, a regularization order has been passed in favour of the illegal occupants. This has really surprised us. Mr. Sawant intends to place on record an additional affidavit. Let the same be filed within one week from today. Copy of the same be served on the advocate for the SRA.

2. We shall hear the parties on such issues on the adjourned date of hearing.

3. In the meantime, our order dated 06 October 2025 in regard to the eviction of the illegal occupants in accordance with law as directed needs to be taken forward and complied with. Compliance report be placed on record of this Court on the adjourned date of hearing.

4. Stand over to 19 November 2025 (H.O.B.)”

4. The aforesaid Order is an interim Order. In the present facts, we find that there is already an Order of regularisation. The petitioners are in occupation of the premises. It is submitted that when the Order was passed by the AGRC, the petitioners were not party to such proceedings. Since the Order of regularisation has already been passed, the said Order will have to be challenged by filing appropriate proceedings. In such view

of the matter, liberty to respondent No.5 to challenge the Order of regularisation, if he so desires is kept open. Obviously, the Order of regularisation is subject to any challenge raised in accordance with law.

5. By keeping all contentions of respondent No.5 open to a challenge the Order of regularisation, the petitions are allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b) and disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)