

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4250 OF 2025

Capt. Haresh Gaglani (Retd)

....Petitioner

Versus

Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai & Ors.Respondents

VINA
ARVIND
KHADPE
Digitally
signed by
VINA
ARVIND
KHADPE
Date:
2026.01.22
10:52:55
+0530

Mr. Darshit Jain, for the Petitioner.

Ms. S. V. Tondwalkar, for the Respondent/BMC.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.
DATE : 20th JANUARY, 2026**

P.C. :-

1. The Petitioner is an individual who claims to be a Member of Respondent No. 4 Narottam Nivas Co-operative Housing Society. The said Society has been arrayed as Respondent No. 4. Allegations are made that the Society is hands in gloves with Respondent No. 3 Shikara Enterprises LLP. The Petitioner suspects that since some of the office bearers of Respondent No. 4 are aligned in commercial activity with Respondent No. 3, they are not opposing a board displayed on the premises of the Society indicating that the re-development of the Co-operative Housing Society has been undertaken by Respondent No. 3.

2. The Petitioner does not have any details as to whether any Resolution was passed by the Society or whether the re-development contract has been signed with Respondent No. 3. The Petitioner has also not served any notice on the Society to ascertain whether the re-development contract has indeed been granted to Respondent No. 3.

3. The object of filing this Petition is to call upon the Municipal Corporation to look into the disputed questions and investigate whether any re-development contract has been executed, whether any Resolution has been passed by the majority, and whether the Petitioner is in the minority. In view of the above, and considering such disputed questions, we do not intend to entertain this Petition.

4. At this stage, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits, on instructions, that the Petitioner would issue a notice to the Society and call for factual details as to whether a re-development contract has been handed over to Respondent No. 3. If no such contract has been entered into with Respondent No. 3 and it is conclusively seen that there is no re-development agreement, the

Petitioner would then approach the Corporation. For the said purpose, the Petitioner desires to withdraw this Petition.

5. In view of the above, **this Petition is disposed off** as withdrawn, as the Petitioner desires to initiate certain steps.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)