ITEM NO.13 COURT NO.3 SECTION IX

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) Nos.27252-27255/2009

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 29/04/2004 in WP No. 45/2004 and order dated 04/03/2005 and order dated 09/08/2005 in RP No. 1/2004 in Writ Petition No.45/2004 and order dated 16/03/2007 in WP No.5454/2006 passed by the High Court Of Bombay)

SATEJ PRAKASHAN AND ANR. Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & ORS. Respondent(s)

(With appln. (s) for c/delay in filing SLP and directions and permission to file additional documents and interim relief and office report)

WITH SLP(C) No. 27863/2009
(With appln.(s) for c/delay in filing SLP)

Date : 18/10/2016 These petitions were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGDISH SINGH KHEHAR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Arunabh Chowdhury, Adv.
Mr. Dipak Bhattacharyya, Adv.
Mr. D.N. Ray, Adv.
Mr. Ajit P. More, Adv.
Mr. Vinodh Kanna B.,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. J.P. Cama, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Pankaj Kr. Mishra, Adv.
Mr. A. S. Bhasme,Adv.

Mr. Nishant Ramakantrao Katneshwarkar,Adv.
Mr. Arpit Rai, Adv.

Mr. Aniruddha P. Mayee, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Delay condoned.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally signed by SANJAY KUMAR
Date: 2016.10.18 18:01:11 IST
Reason:

Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners, we find no justification in entertaining the claim raised by the petitioners in the instant special leave petitions, particularly, keeping in mind that the petitioners were neither the petitioners before the High Court nor

arrayed as party respondents. Be that as it may, we consider it just and appropriate, to direct the CIDCO – respondent no.2, to take a fresh decision, in terms of the direction issued by the High Court in the impugned order dated 29.4.2004, and to communicate the said decision to the petitioners, within two months from today.

In case the petitioners are dissatisfied with the decision passed by the CIDCO, it shall be open to the petitioners to raise a challenge to the decision of the CIDCO, by recourse to an appropriate remedy, in accordance with law.

Interim order passed by this Court on 22.9.2016, shall continue till the order is passed by the CIDCO (referred to above) is communicated to the petitioners.

In view of the above, the special leave petitions stand disposed of.

Pending interlocutory applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar-II)
Court Master

(Renuka Sadana)
Assistant Registrar