

Sbw

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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 22531 OF 2025

Gautam Prathana Construction Pvt.Ltd.

& Anr.

... Petitioners

v/s.

Apex Grievance Redressal Committee

& Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Chaitanya Chavan a/w Mr. Smil Shah & Mr. Roshan Salunkhe
for the Petitioner.

Ms. Ravleen Sabharwal a/w Ms. Arundhati Korale i/by RS Justicia
Law Chambers for the Respondent Nos.1, 2 & 3.

CORAM : KAMAL KHATA, J.

DATED : 18TH AUGUST 2025.

P.C. :

1. Mr. Chavan learned Counsel for the Petitioner, submits that the Petitioner is aggrieved by the Order of the Apex Grievance Redressal Committee (AGRC) dismissing their Appeal at the interim stage itself. It is submitted a praecipe was moved seeking interim reliefs for stay of the implementation of the impugned order dated 11th October 2024, as the Competent Authority was about to appoint a new developer. The matter was accordingly placed on the “mentioning board” on 23rd April 2025 at item no.16.

2. On the said mentioning date itself i.e., on 23rd April 2025, the AGRC heard and disposed of the Appeal finally. It is submitted that the AGRC could not have done so, since the Petitioner were not put to such notice. By this summary hearing and dismissal, grave prejudice is caused to the Petitioner, as a final order came to be passed on arguments advanced only for interim reliefs. The learned Counsel further emphasizes that Concerned Authority retired soon thereafter. He, therefore, by this Petition, seeks a rehearing of the Appeal by the Competent Authority.

3. The matter was kept back for seeking instructions.

4. The learned Advocate for the Respondents submitted that her limited instructions are that the Petitioner was fully heard and the matter has been heard and disposed of finally. She submitted that Petitioner had no case on merits, and the Committee was of the view that the Appeal did not deserve to be entertained. In view thereof, the orders were rightly passed.

5. Having heard both the Advocates, I am of the view that an appropriate reply to the Petition from the Respondents is necessary to determine and decide the relief sought.

6. In the meantime, interim relief in terms of prayer clause (e) is granted.

7. The Advocate for the Respondent Nos.1, 2 and 3 shall file

their reply, if any, by 25th August 2025.

8. List the matter on 8th September 2025 for “admission” when the matter will be disposed finally if time permits.

(KAMAL KHATA, J.)