



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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 35105 OF 2025

Deepak Kondaji Ahire

...Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra  
(Through Ministry of  
Housing and Urban Development)  
and Ors.

...Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Amarendra Mishra - Advocate for the Petitioner  
Adv. Aatish Tayade a/w Adv. Aarushi Yadav i/by Adv. Ravleen  
Sabharwal - for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.  
Smt. Usha Rahi – AGP for Respondent-State

\*\*\*\*\*

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 and learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and learned AGP for Respondent-State.
2. Learned counsel for the Petitioner assures that the copy of the petition will be served on learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 during the course of day.



3. Learned AGP appears for Respondent No. 1-State.
4. With assistance of learned counsel for the Petitioner and learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, we have gone through the memo of the petition.
5. By this petition, the Petitioner seeking the following substantial reliefs :-
  - b) That this Hon'ble Court be pleased to issue Writ of Mandamus, Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ or order or direction quashing and setting aside the Impugned LOI dated 27-05-2015, bearing No. SRA/ENG/2323/STGL/LOI issued by Respondent No. 2 in favour of Respondent No. 3 firm;
  - c) Alternatively, that this Hon'ble Court be pleased to expedite the hearing and final disposal of the said Application No. 17 of 2016 pending before the High Power Committee (SRA), in time-bound manner, as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and appropriate.
6. The Petitioner has challenged the issuance of the impugned LOI which is of the years 2015. The Petitioner approached the High Power Committee (SRA) vide Application No. 17 of 2016. It is grievance of the Petitioner that this Court should consider the challenge made to the LOI in view of the fact that the High Power Committee (SRA) has



failed to adjudicate the application made and which is pending since last 10 years for hearing.

7. Learned counsel for the Petitioner alternatively submitted that the directions should be issued to the High Power Committee (SRA) to decide the application in time bound manner.

8. In our considered view, it may not be possible for us to consider the challenge made to the LOI considering that the Application No. 17 of 2016 is pending before the High Power Committee (SRA). However, the application now needs to be decided expeditiously and in any event within the period of 10 weeks from the date of communication of this order.

9. Learned counsel for the Petitioner on behalf of the Petitioner undertakes to co-operate with High Power Committee (SRA) and shall not seek unnecessary adjournments.

10. Keeping all contentions open, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)