

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 3528 OF 2022
WITH
CHAMBER SUMMONS NO. 108 OF 2019**

Muniyandi Meena JosephPetitioner

Versus

The Chief Secretary Government
of Maharashtra & Anr.Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 2555 OF 2019
CHAMBER SUMMONS NO. 110 OF 2019**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1887 OF 2019
CHAMBER SUMMONS NO. 109 OF 2019**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 2648 OF 2019**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 37478 OF 2025
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 4748 OF 2026**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 37482 OF 2025
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 4753 OF 2026**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 37483 OF 2025
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 4747 OF 2026**

**WITH
WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 37487 OF 2025
INTERIM APPLICATION (L) NO. 4749 OF 2026**

Mr. Moinuddin Chowdhari i/b. A. A. Siddiquie & Associates, for the Petitioners.

Mr. Akshay P. Shinde, for Respondent No. 5 - WP No. 37478 of 2025, WP No. 37482 of 2025, WP No. 37483 of 2025 & WP No. 37487 of 2025.

Mr. Milind More, Addl. GP, for State of Maharashtra – WP No. 3528 of 2022.

Mr. Vishal Thadani – Addl. GP.

Ms. Vaishali Choudhari, Addl. GP.

Mr. Mohit Jadhav, Addl. GP in WP No. 2648 of 2019 & WP(L) No. 37482 of 2025.

Mr. Vishal Thadhani, Addl. GP. - WP(L) No. 37478 of 2025.

Mr. Milind More, Addl. GP. In WP(L) No. 37483 of 2025.

Mr. A. Y. Sakhare Senior Advocate a/w. Advocate K. H. Mastakar, for Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 BMC and Mr. Chaitanya Chavhan a/w K. H. Mastakar, for Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in WP(L) No. 37478 of 2025.

Mr. Gaurav Shrivastav a/w Ms. Manorama Mohanty and Ms. Mallika Mondal i/b. S. K. Srivastav & Co., for Intervenor.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 16th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :-

1. All the parties are unanimous in requesting that these matters may be listed after four weeks.

2. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that these Petitioners are willing to opt for the available options as alternative accommodations. The learned Senior Advocate representing the Corporation submits that 29 various sites were

shown to the Petitioners; however, the Petitioners are not satisfied with any of these sites.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that within two weeks, the Petitioners would express their options. Mr. Sakhare submits that if these options are in conformity with the policies of the Corporation and fit within the dictum of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as by this Court, such alternative sites, without violating any policy or law, can be considered for allocation.

4. In view of the above, stand over for **four weeks**.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)