



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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.16160 OF 2026

SATISH  
RAMCHANDRA  
SANGAR

Digitally signed by  
SATISH RAMCHANDRA  
SANGAR  
Date: 2026.05.05  
19:30:05 +0530

Smt.Manju Ashok Patil  
Daughter of Late Gayatri Ashok Patil (Deceased)  
and Ors. ...Petitioners

V/s.

Apex Grievance Redressal Committee and Ors. ...Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr.Laxman Shahapure a/w Dr.Ajay Jankar i/b. Mr.Tushar Kochale,  
Advocates for Petitioners.

Smt.P.H.Kantharia, Advocate for Respondent No.1-AGRC and  
Respondent Nos.2 and 3-SRA.

Mr.Vikaramjit Garewal a/w Mr.Pankaj Uttaradhi i/b. Ms.Sabeena  
Mahadik, Advocates for Respondent No.5.

Mr.Ashish Kamat (Senior Advocate) a/w Ms.Vidisha Rohina,  
Ms.Rujuta Patil and Mr.Yohaana Shah i/b. Negandhi Shah and  
Himayatullah, Advocates for Respondent No.6 - Developer.

Mr.Himanshu Takke, AGP, for Respondent No.8 - State.

\*\*\*\*\*

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK &  
S. M. MODAK, JJ.

DATE : 5<sup>th</sup> MAY 2026

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners.
2. These are 8 slum dwellers who are challenging the action of  
eviction from their structures. The Petitioners are the members of the  
Respondent No.4 - Co-operative Housing Society. It is the matter of



record that out of 176 members, 165 have already vacated. These are the 8 members who are challenging the demolition.

3. Learned Senior Advocate Shri.Kamat for Respondent No.6 – Developer submitted that out of 8 Petitioners, 6 have already been held eligible. The 6 eligible slum dwellers will be immediately provided transit accommodation. Learned counsel for the Petitioners has grievance about the condition of the transit accommodation. The eligible Petitioners be provided with the transit accommodation. Any grievance regarding the condition of transit accommodation has to be raised in appropriate proceedings.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that though an Appeal is filed before the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee (“AGRC”), the AGRC has not heard the application for stay. We find that the Appeal was filed against the eviction notice dated 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026 on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2026. Learned counsel for AGRC/SRA submitted that though an application for stay is filed, there was no attempt on the part of the Petitioners to move the application for stay before the AGRC. None the less, we have heard the Petitioners considering that the structures are likely to be demolished.

5. We find from the compilation tendered by Mr.Kamat, learned



Senior Advocate that the Petitioner's mother, since deceased, had filed a Writ Petition No.12827 of 2019 in this Court. In paragraph Nos.4 and 5 of the order, it is recorded thus:-

“4. *Similarly, there are several other Petitioners from the list of 631 persons who have revoked their consent and/or are now supporting the Developer in the development concerned. Therefore filing and verification of the Petition itself is in doubt.*

5. *Second Petition namely Writ Petition No.12827 of 2019 which is the companion Petition is of the year 2019. It is filed by three Petitioners, out of whom one has expired in the interregnum and one has already revoked his consent and is now supporting the Developer for development. Only one Petitioner i.e. Petitioner No.2 – Tukaram is continuing with that Petition. Considering that Tukaram as also the other two Petitioners in the first Petition are all eligible persons, there can be no reason as to why the said Petition is filed unless there are serious malafides involved which I do not foresee at the present considering the above time line.”*

6. We may hasten to add that the aforementioned observations are made at the interim stage.

6. It is further pointed out by learned Senior Advocate that the present Society is a part of the same SRA Scheme. In so far as the



occupants in respect of another Society, had filed a Writ Petition (L) No.2965 of 2018 in this Court. This Court by order dated 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2018 had by reasoned order dismissed the Writ Petition. In the Writ Petition, the eviction orders were challenged. The Hon'ble Supreme Court by the order dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2025 dismissed the Special Leave Petitions filed by similar situate slum dwellers.

7. Learned Senior Advocate for the Respondent No.6 – Developer submitted that timelines have been provided in the Affidavit filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court regarding the completion of the Scheme which the Respondent No.6 has to abide by. Learned Senior Advocate for the Developer submits that those Petitioners who are eligible will be immediately provided with the transit accommodation so they will not be left in lurch. So far as the Petitioner Nos.2 and 5 are concerned, learned Senior Advocate for the Developer on instructions submitted that without prejudice to the rights and contentions, subject to the decision on the claim of their eligibility, they will be provided with an alternate accommodation for a period of 11 months from the date of eviction. This is subject to decision on their eligibility. The statement made by learned Senior Advocate on instructions is accepted. The AGRC to hear the Appeal on its own merits.



8. We, therefore, do not find any merit in this Petition. Only in the interest of justice, for a period of 7 days from today, the Petitioners not to be evicted subject to their filing of undertaking in the course of this week that the Petitioners shall vacate the subject structures within a period of 7 days, failing which the Respondents may proceed to take appropriate action.

9. The Writ Petition is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)