

ARJUN
MACHHINDRA
KADAM

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Digitally signed by
ARJUN MACHHINDRA
KADAM
Date: 2026.09.24
17:47:40 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO. 16608 OF 2024

Sulaim Builders and Developers Pvt. Ltd.

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Pritesh Burad a/w. Mrs. Madhuri Gamre i/b Pritesh Burad Associates for the Petitioner.

Mr. Mayuresh Lagu a/w. Mr. Sagar Patil for Respondent No.2.

Mr. Manish Bohra for Respondent No.3.

Smt. M. S. Bane, AGP for the Respondent-State.

CORAM : M. S. KARNIK AND
SANDESH D. PATIL, JJ.

DATED : 24th SEPTEMBER, 2026.

P.C. :

1. By the present petition, the petitioner is impugning the Judgment and order dated 21st September, 2020 passed by the Hon'ble Minister, Urban Development Department, Mumbai. By the said order, the permission granted to respondent No.3 was renewed partially.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner after arguing for some

time seeks liberty of this Court to withdraw the writ petition with liberty to file appropriate proceedings before the Civil Court and also to file appropriate applications before the Civil Court taking Special Civil Suit No. 969 of 2009 for appropriate relief.

3. In light of the above submissions, we permit the learned counsel for the petitioner to withdraw the petition with liberty to file appropriate proceedings before the Civil Court and/or move appropriate applications before the Civil Court taking Special Civil Suit No. 969 of 2009.

4. It is mentioned across the bar by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the District Judge had already expedited the Special Civil Suit No. 969 of 2009.

5. We request the trial Court taking the said suit to decide and dispose of the suit as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of six months of the passing of this Order.

6. With the aforesaid directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

7. All the contentions of all the parties are expressly kept open.

8. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the

impugned order and that the same would be subject to decision of the Civil Court.

(SANDESH D. PATIL, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)