

Priyanka

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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.13516 OF 2025

Dahisar Shree Avdhoot CHS Ltd.	... Petitioner
v/s.	
State of Maharashtra & Ors.	... Respondents

Mr. Kartik Garg a/w Mr. Aashka Shell i/by Roshan Naik for the Petitioner.

Ms. Usha Rahi, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 & 19 – State.

Mr. Prasad Apte for Respondent Nos. 2 to 18.

CORAM : KAMAL KHATA, J.
DATED : 15TH DECEMBER 2025

P.C. :

1. The Advocate for the Respondent Nos. 2 to 18 seeks a further period of one week to file his reply to the Petition.
2. He submits that the Order dated 1st December 2025 could not be complied with since there were eighteen Respondents. Such a ground cannot justify non-compliance with the Court's order.
3. The Advocate has failed to approach the Court and seek an extension after 8th December 2025 for one additional week. He accordingly got two weeks to comply; however, even today, he seeks a further extension of one week.
4. This delay is causing severe prejudice to the Petitioner. Accordingly, for non-compliance with the Court's order, costs of Rs. 20,000/- are imposed, to be paid to the Petitioner within a period of one week from today.

5. The Advocate for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 19 states that the arguing Advocate is unavailable on account of illness and therefore, seeks one week's time to file a reply.

6. On perusal of the orders on record, it is observed that the Petition was served upon the Respondent No. 1 and 19 in June of 2025, and despite the lapse of over six months, no reply has been filed. This continued delay has caused serious prejudice to the Petitioner, whose entire re-development has been stalled; affecting 220 members awaiting re-development.

7. Accordingly, I am inclined to impose costs of Rs.60,000/- upon Respondents Nos. 1 and 19 payable to the Petitioner within a period of one week from today. Upon hearing the quantum of costs, the Advocate submits that they do not wish to file an affidavit in the matter. The statement is noted.

8. It is clarified that the Advocate for the Respondent No. 1 and 19 shall not be permitted to dispute any factual averments. Only legal submissions, if any, will be heard, since having sought time to file an affidavit, they have now chosen to abstain from doing so to avoid paying costs.

9. Accordingly, list the matter on 5th January 2026.

(KAMAL KHATA, J.)