

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

(SR No. 11) WRIT PETITION NO. 7556 OF 2005
AND

(SR. No. 12) WRIT PETITION NO. 7557 OF 2005
AND

(SR. No. 13) WRIT PETITION NO. 7559 OF 2005

SNEHA
NITIN
CHAVAN

Digitally signed
by SNEHA
NITIN CHAVAN
Date:
2026.04.18
10:08:51 +0530

Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal And Anr ...Petitioners

Versus

Kashyap Patel And Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Girish Godbole, senior Advocate and Ms. Manorama Mahanty and
Mr. Hitanshu Jain i/b S.K. Shrivastav and Co. for the Petitioners.
Mr. Sandip Babar, AGP for Respondent/State.

CORAM : M.M. SATHAYE, J.

DATE : 17th APRIL, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned senior Advocate for the Petitioners.
2. Writ Petition No. 7556 of 2005 is filed by the Petitioner Shri. Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal and Petitioner No.2 Pravin H. Doshi challenging the order dated 07.07.2005 below Exh. 23 passed by the Deputy Charity Commissioner, Greater Mumbai Region, Mumbai in Application No. ACC-I/50/1999.
3. Writ Petition No. 7557 of 2005 is filed by the Petitioner Shri. Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal and Petitioner No.2 Pravin H. Doshi challenging the order dated 07.07.2005 below Exh. 15 passed by the Deputy Charity Commissioner, Greater Mumbai Region, Mumbai in Application No. ACC-I/53/1999.

4. Writ Petition No. 7559 of 2005 is filed by the Petitioner Shri. Vile Parle Kelavani Mandal and Petitioner No.2 Pravin H. Doshi challenging the order dated 07.07.2005 below Exh. 20 passed by the Deputy Charity Commissioner, Greater Mumbai Region, Mumbai in Application No. ACC-I/52/1999.

5. The applications were filed by Petitioner No.2 requesting to delete the name of previous Reporting Trustee and allowing his name to be shown as Reporting Trustee.

6. Schedule of change indicates that changes are of the year 1998 and a long period of 28 years has since passed.

7. Learned Senior Advocate Mr. Godbole appearing for the Petitioner fairly submitted that there is no interim relief granted in any of the petitions. He submitted that during long pendency of the petitions, many subsequent changes have taken place in respect of the Petitioner No.1 Trust which are reported to the concerned office of the Charity Commissioner Mumbai.

8. Considering the nature of the impugned orders and the fact that subsequent changes have taken place which are already reported, the petitions have become infructuous.

9. **The Petitions are accordingly disposed of as infructuous.**

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)