



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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 28962 OF 2025

Sunshine Builders and Developers  
A Partnership Firm

...Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Chief Executive Officer  
Slum Rehabilitation Authority

2. The Deputy Chief Engineer  
Slum Rehabilitation Authority

...Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Shardul Singh, Mr. Smeet Savla i/by SHS Chambers - Advocate for  
the Petitioner

Adv. Aarushi Yadav, Mr. Aatish Tayade, Adv. Yashi Bhatt i/by Adv.  
Ravleen Sabharwal - for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2-SRA

\*\*\*\*\*

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

DATE : 15<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2026

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner.
2. The Respondent No. 1 terminated the appointment of the  
Petitioner as Developer for implementation of Slum Rehabilitation  
Scheme by an order dated 29.06.2015. The Petitioner was asked to  
submit the details of the expenses incurred by the Petitioner towards



the development and implementation of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme.

3. Suffice to observe that by letter dated 27.10.2021 of Respondent No. 2 addressed to 1<sup>st</sup> valuer, the Respondent No. 2 furnished details submitted by the Petitioner. The 1<sup>st</sup> valuer was asked to submit the valuation report. The appointment of the 1<sup>st</sup> valuer was cancelled following repetitive neglect to submit the valuation. SRA therefore appointed valuer by another letter dated 19.09.2022. A 3<sup>rd</sup> valuer was thereafter appointed to carry out the valuation of expenses incurred by the Petitioner by letter dated 10.10.2022.

4. Respondent No. 1 furnished valuation report dated 31.01.2023 prepared by 3<sup>rd</sup> valuer approving an amount of Rs. 211,10,00,000/- (Rupees Two Hundred and Eleven Crores Ten Lakh only) without calculating any interest.

5. The Petitioner, therefore, by letter dated 15.02.2023 requested the Respondent No. 2 that interest ought to have been taken into consideration in the valuation report. Petitioner issued a letter dated 17.07.2025 addressed to the Respondent No. 1-SRA to resolve the issues faced by the Petitioner, on failure of which the Petitioner would



adopt appropriate legal remedies.

6. Petition is therefore filed on the following substantial reliefs:-

- a) That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of Mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, directing the Respondents to pass necessary orders / directions for compliance of Section 13(3) as modified by Section 3D of the Act, and further to take all consequential steps to ensure such payment of the compensation payable to the Petitioner for expenditure incurred towards the implementation of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme within a period of two weeks or within such time as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit. and to accept the said amount upon such deposit;
- b) That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue a writ of Mandamus, or any other appropriate writ, order, or direction under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, directing the Respondent No. 1 to remit the sum of Rs. 211,10,00,000/- (Rupees Two Hundred and Eleven Crores and Ten Lakhs only) along with interest to the Petitioner for expenditure incurred towards the implementation of the Slum Rehabilitation Scheme (as per the valuation report dated 31st January 2023), with the Petitioner within a period of two weeks or within such time as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit, and to accept the said amount upon such deposit;

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner invited our attention to the



communication dated 06.02.2023. By this communication addressed by the SRA to the New Developer M/s. Havemore Realty Private Ltd. as well as Petitioner, SRA directed the new Developer as well as the Petitioner to submit the say with respect to the copy of the valuation report of the expenses prepared by the valuer in order to enable the office to process the matter further.

8. Learned counsel for the Petitioner makes a grievance that, so far as issue regarding the payment to be made to the Petitioner ought to have been to the logical conclusion.

9. We have heard learned counsel for SRA, who made an attempt to justify as to why the payment has not been made. However, we find from the communication dated 06.02.2023 that the issue is still pending for further processing at the level of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

10. In such view of the matter, the Respondent No. 1-CEO is directed to look into the issue and ensure that the communication dated 06.02.2023 be taken into its logical conclusion by processing the matter in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of communication of this order.



11. Since the matter is under consideration by the Respondent No. 1 obviously, the aspect of payment of the interest shall also be considered by the Respondent No. 1.

12. Keeping all contentions open, the Writ Petition is disposed of. The decision be taken in accordance with law.

13. It is made clear that the process will be taken forward after hearing the Petitioner as well as new Developer.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)