

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 11380 OF 2026**

Parmanand Dingra and another ... Petitioners

vs.

The State of Maharashtra,
Urban Development Department and others ... Respondents

Mr. Tejesh Dande a/w. Mr. Tanuj Kabra, i/b. Mr. Aniket Shitole for petitioners.

Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 5 – State authorities.

Mr. Abhijit P. Kulkarni a/w. Mr. Abhishek Roy for respondent Nos.2 to 4 – PMC.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ**

DATE : 07th OCTOBER, 2026

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners. Respondent Nos.1 and 5 – State authorities are represented by Ms. Bane, learned AGP and respondent Nos. 2 to 4 - Pune Municipal Corporation are represented by Mr. Kulkarni, learned counsel.

2. On 31.08.2026, this Court had passed the following order:

- ‘1. When this petition was taken up for consideration, the learned counsel appearing for Respondents No. 2 to 4 (officers of the Pune Municipal Corporation) submitted that he would take instructions in the matter, as the grievance of the petitioners is that they may be dispossessed from their property without appropriate steps being taken for acquisition, determination of compensation, and payment thereof.
2. List for further consideration on 16th September 2026, to be included in the category of fresh matters.
3. Although the learned counsel for the respondent Corporation submits that the apprehension of the petitioners about coercive action is misplaced, we direct that in the event the respondent Corporation

intends to take any coercive action, notice of at least 72 hours shall be given to the petitioners.’

3. The respondents have not filed their reply affidavits. But, since they are represented before this Court, the learned counsel for the respondents were heard. The prayer in the present petition pertains to challenge to a letter dated 26.08.2024 issued on behalf of the respondent – Municipal Corporation, stating that the subject land of the petitioner would be required for the purposes of road widening and that it can be taken over by negotiations and compensation could be given in the form of FSI or TDR.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners, on instructions, states that the petitioners are not ready to be compensated by way of FSI or TDR and that in any case, the respondent – Municipal Corporation cannot take possession of the subject land unilaterally and that it must follow the due process of acquisition and payment of compensation, before taking physical possession of the subject land for the purpose of road-widening.

5. Considering the grievance of the petitioners, this writ petition can be disposed of by issuing appropriate directions.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of by directing that in the event the respondent – Municipal Corporation requires the subject land of the petitioners i.e. 11944 sq.ft. Land located in Survey No.84/6 at Koregaon Park, Mundhwa, Pune, it shall proceed strictly in accordance with law, for acquisition thereof, either by way of negotiations or compulsory acquisition and upon determination of quantum of compensation, pay the same to the petitioners before taking physical possession of the subject property.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)