

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

Writ Petition No. 995 of 2026

Anil Bhikaji Rangankar	...	Petitioner
V/s.		
The State of Maharashtra and others	...	Respondents.

Mr. Sanjeev B. Deore a/w. Mr. Arman Ansari i/b. Suchita J. Pawar for the petitioner.

Mr. Harshwardhan Karande i/b. Vishwanath Patil for respondent
Nos.2 and 4 – SRA.

Mr. S.V. Tondwalkar for respondent No.3 – BMC.

Ms. Gaurangi Patil, AGP for the State.

Mr. Mayur Khandeparkar a/aw. Mr. Parth Shah a/w. Kevin Pereira
a/w. Advocate Khambekar i/b. Mr. Chinmaya Acharya for
respondent No.5.

**CORAM : M.S. KARNIK &
S.M. MODAK, JJ.**

DATE : 4th March 2026.

P.C. :

1. Mr. Khandeparkar, learned counsel raises a preliminary objection about the maintainability of this petition as an alternate efficacious remedy is available.
2. After arguing the petition for some time, learned counsel for the petitioner, on instructions, submitted that the petitioner would be satisfied if the representation which is on Page-96 dated 8th

September 2016 and dated 5th January 2022 on Page-117 of the writ petition is looked into to redress the grievance of the petitioner. Learned counsel for respondent No.5 submitted that challenge is highly belated. It is made clear that we are requesting the Assistant Commissioner to look into the representation and all contentions in the representation dated 8th February 2016 including the question of delay is kept open. Representation be decided expeditiously.

3. In case the concerned authority proposes to pass any adverse orders against respondent No.5, he shall be given an opportunity of hearing in accordance with law.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel for respondent No.5 that not only representation is made to authority not competent to decide the grievance but scheme is already completed. All the contentions are kept open.

5. Writ Petition is disposed of.

(S.M.MODAK,J.)

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)