

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.7687 OF 2026

Ayyaz Mahamoodmiya Inamdar ... Petitioner
Vs.
Chief Officer Pen Municipal Council
and others ... Respondents

AND
WRIT PETITION NO.7688 OF 2026
AND
WRIT PETITION NO.7689 OF 2026
AND
WRIT PETITION NO.7690 OF 2026

Mr. Satish Muley a/w. Mr. Mosin Naik, Mr. Ahad Adhikari and Ms. Jayesh R. Ghase for Petitioners in all the Petitions.

Ms. Gauri R. Raghuwanshi, AGP for Respondents-State in WP/7687/2026.

Ms. Tanu Bhatia, AGP for Respondents-State in WP/7688/2026.

Ms. Pooja Patil, AGP for Respondents-State in WP/7689/2026.

Ms. Pooja Joshi Deshpande AGP for Respondents-State in WP/7690/2026.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.**

DATE : JUNE 19, 2026

P.C. :

. These petitions have been taken on production board on a serious apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioners that there is a likelihood of demolition of structures wherein the petitioners claim to be the tenants. The petitions have placed on record legal notices addressed to the respondent No.1 - Chief Officer of the Pen Municipal Corporation, District - Raigad, wherein it is stated that notices appear to have been served on the landlords of the petitioners with regard to the proposed demolition of the structures in the light of road widening project.

2. It is the contention of the petitioners that being occupants of the structures in question, they are at least entitled to a notice from the respondent Municipal Council before any step is taken as regards the structures in question.

3. We find that other than the legal notices issued on behalf of the petitioners, alleging that the respondent Municipal Council intends to act against the structures in question, there is no material to support the apprehension raised on behalf of the petitioners and the extreme urgency projected on their behalf.

4. It would be appropriate that the Municipal Council is represented before this Court and thereupon the question of ad-interim relief is considered.

5. The respondent Nos.2 and 3 being the Collector, Raigad and the State of Maharashtra are already represented by the learned AGPs and therefore, only the respondent No.1 in these petitions being the Municipal Council is required to be served.

6. Considering the urgency of the matter, issue notice in all these petitions, returnable on 23.06.2026, to be included in the supplementary list.

7. Learned AGPs waive notice on behalf of the respondent Nos.2 and 3 in respective petitions. *Humdast* granted for respondent No.1.

8. Additionally, the petitioners are directed to serve the respondent No.1 by way of private service and to file an affidavit of service before the next date of listing.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)