

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO.1674 OF 2025

Laxman Ravji Paste ... Petitioner  
**Vs.**  
Grievance Redressal Committee,  
Slum Rehabilitation Authority and others ... Respondents

Mr. Nitin Gaware Patil a/w. Mr. Divyesh K. Jain for Petitioner.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE, J.**  
**DATE : OCTOBER 07, 2025**

**P.C. :**

1. Heard Mr. Patil, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Respondent Nos.1 to 3 have passed concurrent orders against the petitioner, as a consequence of which, he may be dispossessed from tenement No.1114 of 'B' Wing in the rehabilitation component of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme. The aforesaid action has been triggered by a proceeding initiated by respondent No.5 before respondent No.3 - Deputy Collector, Slum Rehabilitation Authority.
3. Having perused the documents on record, it appears that due to similarity in the names of the petitioner - Laxman Ravji Paste and the respondent No.5 - Laxman Sitaram Patre, the petitioner is facing the drastic consequence of being dispossessed of the said tenement. The documents on record also indicate that, both, the petitioner as well as the respondent No.5 are found eligible for being allotted tenements in the rehabilitation component.
4. The possession letter dated 04.04.2014 and the reasoning contained in the order dated 25.08.2022 passed by the competent officer of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority show that the petitioner is found

eligible at Sr. No.1296 of Annexure II. But, in the operative portion of the order dated 25.08.2022 of the competent officer of the SRA, the name of respondent No.5 is recorded while granting relief. It appears that the effect of the possession letter dated 04.04.2014 and the reasoning recorded in the order dated 25.08.2022 have escaped the attention of respondent Nos.1 to 3 while passing the impugned orders.

5. Issue notice for final disposal, returnable on 27.11.2025.

6. Additionally, the petitioner is permitted to serve the respondents by way of private service and to file an affidavit of service before the next date of listing.

7. Considering the documents placed on record, *prima facie* case is made out by the petitioner for granting ad-interim relief. This Court also finds that unless ad-interim relief is granted, the petitioner will face the drastic consequence of being dispossessed of the said tenement, despite the fact that he was put in possession thereof in pursuance of the possession letter dated 04.04.2014. The balance of convenience, therefore, appears to be in favour of the petitioner. Hence, in the meanwhile, there shall be ad-interim relief in terms of prayer clause [D] in respect of tenement No.1114.

**(MANISH PITALE, J.)**

*Minal Parab*