



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**INTERIM APPLICATION (ST.) NO. 39481 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 5329 OF 2021**

Mumbai Bus Malak Sangathan (Registered)

Through its Secretary

Koragappa Venkappa Shetty

...Applicant/

Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra

Through its Secretary (Urban Development)

Mantralya, Mumbai and Anr.

...Respondents

Mr. Suhas S. Deokar a/w. Mr. Tanmay M. Shembavanekar,
Advocate for the Applicant/Petitioner.

Mr. M.M. Pabale, AGP for the Respondent – State.

**CORAM: BHARATI DANGRE &
MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATED: 4th MAY 2026.

PC :-

1. The Applicant seeks recall of the order dated 8th March, 2025 passed by the Registrar (Judicial-I), whereby the Petition came to be rejected for non-removal of office objections. The rejection was pursuant to a common notice/order dated 8th March 2024, which reads thus:

“ All the petitions within the roster of this Bench that are still on a lodging number must have objections removed and Petitions finally numbered no later than by 30th March, 2024, failing which all these Petitions will stand rejected



and ad-interim/interim orders, if any, will stand automatically vacated without further reference to the Court.

2. It is submitted that when the said order came to be passed, the matter was not listed on the Board and consequently the Petition came to be dismissed for non-removal of office objections. The Writ Petition filed by the Petitioner was covered by the common order passed by this Court.

3. It is further submitted that the order passed by this Court was not within the knowledge of the advocate for the Applicant and the order of dismissal was also not uploaded. Consequently, the said dismissal could not be noticed by the advocate for the Applicant. While checking the status of the matter, the advocate for the Applicant noticed that a conditional order had been passed, whereby the Writ Petition stood dismissed for non removal of office objections.

4. Thereafter, the Applicant immediately filed the present Application for restoration of the Writ Petition. However, there is a delay of 1 year and 194 days in filing the present Application. It is submitted that the delay is unintentional and has occurred due to lack of knowledge of the order passed by this Court. It is also stated that the Applicant undertakes remove the office objections within a period of six weeks.



5. We are satisfied with the explanation offered by the Applicant in the Interim Application giving sufficient cause for delay. Accordingly, the delay of 1 year and 194 days is condoned and the order dated 8th March 2024 stands recalled.

6. The Interim Application is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b) and is accordingly disposed of.

(MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.)

(BHARATI DANGRE, J.)