



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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 38501 OF 2022

Shamrav Dhondiba Kamble

...Petitioner

Versus

Mumbai Housing and Area Development Board
(A MHADA Unit) & Ors.

...Respondents

Ms. Bhagyashri Mangale i/b. Mr. Vinayak Phadke, Advocates, for
the Petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil Adkine i/b. Mr. Hassan Khan, Advocates, for the
Respondent No.1.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED : 4th SEPTEMBER 2024

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1. By the present Writ Petition preferred under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the challenge is to the legality and validity of the order dated 15th October 2019 (“**impugned order**”) passed by the Deputy Chief Officer, Dharavi Redevelopment Project/Mill, Mumbai Housing and Area Development Board (A MHADA Unit), (“**MHADA**”), Mumbai. By the impugned order, allotment of Room No.108, 1st Floor, Building No.1/B, Prakash Cotton Mill Compound, Lower Parel, Mumbai – 400 013 (“**said premises**”) to the Petitioner in lottery conducted for mill workers has been cancelled on the ground that the Petitioner has

failed to pay the requisite amount of Rs.9,50,000/- within the prescribed time of Provisional Offer Letter dated 3rd May 2018. The Petitioner has also sought prayer to the effect that the Respondent Nos.1 and 2 be directed to provide sufficient time to deposit the amount as mentioned in the provisional offer letter dated 3rd May 2018. In effect the Petitioner has challenged all orders by which his request for extension of time for payment of the said amount has been rejected. The Petitioner has also sought prayer of allotment of the said premises in favour of the Petitioner.

2. Before considering the reliefs sought by the Petitioner, it is necessary to set out certain factual aspects.

(a) The Petitioner was working as mill worker in the Cotton Textile Mill in Mumbai.

(b) Due to strike of mill workers of the year 1982, the Petitioner lost his job as mill worker and he faced several hardships and presently staying at his native at village - Batkanangale, Taluka - Gadhinglaj, District - Kolhapur. The Petitioner is a Senior Citizen of 76 years.

(c) Regulation 58 of the Development Control Regulations For Greater Mumbai, 1991 (“**D.C.R., 1991**”) were amended in the year 2001 *inter alia* providing residential premises for mill workers on mill lands.

(d) Thereafter, in the lottery which has been conducted on 9th May 2016 for mill workers, the Petitioner has been declared as successful in the said lottery and he has been asked to submit various documents to prove his eligibility and thereafter, on the basis of the documents submitted by the Petitioner, he has been held eligible.

(e) Provisional Offer Letter (“**POL**”) dated 3rd May 2018 has been issued to the Petitioner allotting him the said premises. By the said POL, the Petitioner has been directed to deposit an amount of Rs.9,50,000/-. Out of said amount of Rs.9,50,000/-, 10% amount was directed to be deposited by 16th June 2018 and 90% amount was directed to be deposited by 15th August 2018. It has been further directed that in case of delay, the interest charged would be 11%.

(f) The Petitioner thereafter sent representations dated 21st December 2018, 26th December 2018 and 28th December 2018 for extension of time for making payment as per said POL. However, the said representations of the Petitioner were rejected. Thereafter again the Petitioner sought extension of time by his representation dated 26th August 2019 and the said request was also rejected. The Petitioner again sent several representations including representations dated 10th January 2020, 15th January 2020 and 16th June 2021. However, all these representations seeking extension of time to make payment as per POL has been rejected. All these representations have been rejected on the ground that the Petitioner has not made payment of 1st installment of 10% of the amount i. e. payment of Rs. 95,000/- and therefore, the request for extension of time cannot be granted. The relevant portion of office noting (Page 46) in this behalf is as follows:

“मा. उपाध्यक्ष/प्रा. यांचे दिनांक ०६/०४/२०१८ च्या शुध्दीपत्रकनुसार (पृष्ठ क्र. C/७९) अर्जदारास दुस-या टप्प्यातील (म्हणजे उर्वरीत सदनिकेची १०% रक्कम) सदनिकेची विक्री किंमत भरण्याकरीता १०५ दिवसांची निश्चित काळावधी संपुष्टात आल्यानंतर पुढील ७ दिवसाच्या

आत मुदतवाढीसाठी अर्ज केल्यास, सक्षम प्रधिकारी (मा. मुख्य अधिकारी/मुं.मं.) यांना योग्य वाटल्यास मुदतवाढ जास्तीत जास्त १० दिवसांपर्यंत मुदतवाढ देता येईल असे नमूद केले आहे. सदरच्या नियम हा ज्या अर्जदाराने सदनिकेची १०% रक्कम भरली असेल त्यांनाच लागू होतो. सदय स्थितीत अर्जदार श्री. शामराव धोंडिबा कांबळे यांनी सदनिकेची प्रथम टप्प्यातील १०% रक्कम भरलेली नाही. त्यामुळे वरील सुधारीत धोरणानुसार मुदतवाढ देता येत नाही.”

(Emphasis added)

The English translation of the same is as follows:

*“In the Corrigendum dated 06.04.2018 (Page No. C/79) issued by the Deputy Chairman/Pra. (Competent Authority), it has been mentioned therein that, for making payment of second installment of the sale price of the Flat (i.e. the remaining 90% amount of sale price of the Flat), if an Applicant makes an application for granting him an extension of time, within a period of next 07 days after the prescribed specific period of 105 days is over, the Competent Authority (Chief Officer/Mumbai Board), if deems it proper, may grant an extension of time up to the period of maximum 90 days. **This Rule becomes applicable only to those applicants who have paid the 10% amount from out of the sale price of the Flat. In the present case, the Applicant Shri Shamrao Dhondiba Kamble has not paid the said 10% amount of the first installment of the sale price of the Flat and therefore, as per the Revised Policy, extension of time cannot be granted to him.**”*

(g) In effect the challenge in this Writ Petition is to all these orders by which the Petitioner's several representations requesting to grant him time to deposit said amount of Rs.9,50,000/- have been rejected.

3. Mr. Hassan Khan, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondents relied on the Resolution No.6789 dated 12th October 2018 of the MHADA. However, perusal of the said Resolution clearly shows that the same is applicable to the allottees who have applied to MHADA for purchasing the flats sold by MHADA in the open market by conducting lottery and such flats are allotted to those Applicants/Purchasers in the lottery conducted by MHADA. The said Circular will not strictly apply to the Petitioner.

4. In the facts and circumstances, this Court has passed detailed order dated 7th August 2024 and learned Counsel appearing for the MHADA has been directed to take instructions from Vice-President, MHADA. The said direction was passed as it was represented by the Petitioner that he had collected said amount of Rs.9,50,000/- with great difficulties and he is also ready to pay reasonable interest for delay in making the payment.

5. This Court by order dated 12th August 2024 passed the following direction:

“4. The Petitioner who is personally present in Court states that now he has made arrangement for said amount of Rs.9,50,000/- and the same can be deposited with the MHADA within a period of ten days from today. Mr. Hassan Khan, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent Nos.1 & 2 state that as per the policy of MHADA, the Petitioner has to pay interest. However, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner states that if some additional time is granted, the Petitioner can make arrangement for the interest amount. She further states that under Section 164 of the Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Act, 1976 (“MHADA”), the State of Maharashtra can issue appropriate directions to MHADA to waive the interest. That aspect can be examined at a later date. However, as the Petitioner has made arrangements for deposit of amount of Rs.9,50,000/-, if the said amount is deposited with the MHADA within a period of ten days, the MHADA shall immediately handover possession of the said Room No.108, 1st floor, Building No.1/B, Prakash Cotton Mill Compound, Shankarrao Naram Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai – 400 013 to the Petitioner, subject to further orders to be passed in this Writ Petition.”

(Emphasis added)

6. Accordingly, the Petitioner has deposited with the MHADA said amount of Rs.9,50,000/- on 21.08.2024 and possession of the said premises has been handed over to the Petitioner immediately

on the very day. However, as clarified in the said Order dated 12.08.2024, acceptance of the said amount by the MHADA and handing over possession of the said premises to the Petitioner is subject to the further Orders to be passed in this Writ Petition.

7. Before consideration of challenge to the impugned Orders, it is necessary to examine the applicable provisions of law and the legal position :-

7.1 Regulation 58 concerning development or redevelopment of lands of cotton textile mills of *Development Control Regulations for Greater Mumbai, 1991* (“DCR 1991”) is modified by Notification dated 20th March 2001. The relevant portion of Regulation 58 of DCR, 1991 is clause No.7(a), which reads as under:

“ 58. Development or redevelopment of lands of cotton textile mills;

(7) Notwithstanding anything contained above--

(a) If and when the build up areas of a cotton textile mill occupied for residential purposes as on the 1st of January 2000 developed or redeveloped, it shall be obligatory on the part of the land owner to provide to the occupants in lieu of each tenement covered by the development or redevelopment

scheme, free of cost, an alternative tenement of the size of 225 sq.ft. Carpet area;

[Provided that no such occupants shall be evicted till such time, he/she is provided with alternative accommodation of the 225 sq.ft. Carpet area in such development or redevelopment scheme.]

[For reconstruction/redevelopment to be undertaken by landlord/or Co-operative Housing Society of occupiers in respect of residential building/chawls located on the lands of Cotton Textile Mills, the following conditions shall apply--

(i) In case redevelopment of buildings occupying part of larger holding, the notional area of plot on the basis of permissible FSI and the total built up area of the building shall be computed and thereafter considering the notional area of the plot, FSI of 4.0 shall be allowed.

(ii) The FSI computation of 4.00 shall be as follows:--

Rehab area shall be the total built up area required for rehabilitation of all the occupants of residential buildings/chawls with the carpet area of 27.88 sq.mt. each. In case of authorised non-residential occupier existing occupier on 1st January 2000 the area to be given in the reconstructed building will be equivalent to the area occupied in the old building.

Difference between FSI 4.00 and FSI used for rehabilitation of existing occupants shall be used and shared as follows:--

(a) Available difference shall be divided into two parts in a ration of 1:40.

(b) Out of these two parts, 1.00 shall be constructed by the mill owners in the form of additional tenements having 27.88 sq.mtrs. carpet area each and shall be handed over to MHADA/Government and to be used for rehabilitation of mill workers.

(c) The mill owners shall be entitled for FSI of above 0.4 part as stated in (a) in lieu of construction done and handed over to MHADA/Government.

(d) Construction for rehabilitation of all the occupants of residential buildings/chawls shall be done by mill owner. No incentive FSI against such construction shall be permitted.

(iii) All the occupants of the old building shall be re-accommodated in the redeveloped building.

(iv) In case of the cess building, the list of occupants and area occupied by each of them in the old building shall be certified by Mumbai Repairs and Reconstruction Board and for other building it shall be certified by Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai.

(v) In case of dispute the matter shall be referred to the Monitoring Committee and the decision of the committee shall be binding on all parties.

(vi) An amount of Rs.20,000/- per tenement have to be deposited by developer as a corpus fund with the society of the occupants at the time of completion of construction for maintenance of the buildings.

(vii) Notwithstanding anything contained in these Regulations, the relaxation's incorporated in regulation No.33(7) of these regulations and amended from time to time, shall apply."

(Emphasis added)

Thus, what is provided in Regulation 58 of DCR, 1991 is that if and when the built up areas of a cotton textile mill occupied for residential purposes as on the 1st January 2000 developed or

redeveloped, it shall be obligatory on the part of the land owner to provide to the occupants in lieu of each tenement covered by the development or redevelopment scheme, free of cost, an alternative tenement of the size of 225 sq.ft. Carpet area. Apart from that, it is provided that difference between FSI 4.00 and FSI used for rehabilitation of existing occupants shall be used and shared in a ratio of 1:40. Out of these two parts, 1.00 shall be constructed by the mill owners in the form of additional tenements having 27.88 sq.mtrs. carpet area each and shall be handed over to MHADA/Government and to be used for rehabilitation of mill workers and the mill owners shall be entitled for FSI of above 0.4 part in lieu of construction done and handed over to MHADA/Government.

7.2 The *Development Control and Promotion Regulations For Greater Mumbai, 2034* (“**DCPR, 2034**”) came into force w.e.f. 1st September 2018. The Regulation No. 35 of the DCPR, 2034 is concerning development or re-development of lands of Cotton Textile Mills. The relevant portion of the same reads as under :-

“35. Development or redevelopment of lands of cotton textile mills (mills)

*(1) Lands of sick and/or closed cotton textile mills:-
 With the previous approval of the Commissioner to a layout prepared for development or redevelopment of the entire open land and built-up area of a sick and/or closed cotton textile mill and on such conditions deemed appropriate and specified by him and as a part of a package of measures recommended by the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR) for the revival/rehabilitation of a potentially viable sick and/or closed mill, the Commissioner may allow:-*

(a) The existing built-up areas to be utilised-

(i) For the same cotton textile or related uses subject to observance of all other Regulations;

(ii) For diversified industrial uses in accordance with the industrial location policy, with office space only ancillary to and required for such uses, subject to and observance of all other Regulations;

(iii) For commercial purposes, as permitted under these Regulations;

(b) Open lands and balance FSI shall be used as in the Table below:-

<i>Serial No.</i>	<i>Extent</i>	<i>Percentage to be earmarked for Garden/Playground or any other POS as specified by the Commissioner</i>	<i>Percentage to be earmarked and handed over for development by MHADA for Public Housing/for mill worker's housing as per guidelines approved by Government, to be shared equally</i>	<i>Percentage to be earmarked and to be developed for residential or commercial use (including uses permissible in residential or commercial zone as per these Regulations) or diversified Industrial uses as per Industrial Location Policy,</i>

				<i>to be developed by the owner</i>
1	2	3	4	5
1	No limit	33	33	34

.....

(7) Notwithstanding anything contained above -

[(a) if and when the built up areas of a cotton textile mill occupied for residential/residential cum commercial purposes as on the 1st of January, 2000 developed or redeveloped, it shall be obligatory on the part of the land owner to provide to the occupants in lieu of each tenement covered by the development or redevelopment scheme, free of cost, an alternative tenement of the size of 405 sq ft carpet area;

Provided that no such occupants shall be evicted till such time, he/she is provided with alternative accommodation of the size 405 sq ft carpet area in such development or redevelopment scheme. However, fungible compensatory area as permissible as per Regulation No 31(3) on the rehab component shall not be allowed for residential/ residential cum commercial. Fungible compensatory area as permissible as per Regulation No 31(3) shall be allowed only for non residential units or existing authorized area.]

(i) In case of redevelopment of buildings occupying part of larger holding, the notional area of plot on the basis of Zonal (basic)FSI and the total built up area of the building shall be computed and thereafter considering such notional area of the plot, FSI of 4.0 shall be allowed.

(ii) The FSI computation of 4.00 shall be as follows :

Rehab area shall be the total built up area required for rehabilitation of all the occupants of

residential buildings/chawls with the carpet area of 37.63 sq m (405sq. ft) each or existing carpet area whichever is more. In case of authorized non-residential occupier existing on 1st January, 2000 the area to be given in the reconstructed building will be equivalent to the area occupied in the old building.

Provided further that each eligible residential cum commercial occupant shall be entitled to a tenement of minimum carpet area of 37.63 sq. m ((405 sq. ft.).However, fungible compensatory area as permissible as per Regulation No 31(3) on the rehab component shall not be allowed. for residential/ residential cum commercial. Fungible compensatory area as permissible as per Regulation No 31(3) shall be allowed only for non residential units or existing authorized area.

Difference between FSI 4.00 and FSI used for rehabilitation of existing occupants shall be used and shared as follow:

(a) Available difference shall be divided into two parts in a ratio of 1:60.

(b) Out of these two parts, 1.00 shall be constructed by the mill owners in the form of additional tenements having 27.88 sq. m(300 sq. ft) carpet area each and shall be handed over to MHADA/Government and to be used for rehabilitation of mill workers.

(c) The mill owners shall be entitled for FSI of above 0.6parts as stated in (a) in lieu of construction done and handed over to MHADA/Government.

(d) Construction for rehabilitation of all the occupants of residential buildings/chawls shall be done by mill owner. No incentive FSI against such construction shall be given to landlord/or Co-op. Housing society of occupiers.

(iii) All the occupant of the old building shall be re-accommodated in the redeveloped building.”

(Emphasis added)

Thus, DCPR, 2034 also provides that mill workers shall be provided houses on the mill lands.

7.3 Regulation 58 of the DCR, 1991 and Regulation 35 of the DCPR, 2034 provide that the mill workers who are having residential premises on the mill land are to be given alternate rehab premises on the same land and further provide that other mill workers also shall be rehabilitated *inter alia* by providing rehab premises constructed on the mill land and such premises are to be handed over by the mill owners to the MHADA and the MHADA after conducting lottery shall allot the same to the eligible mill workers.

8. It is well known that these provisions of the D.C. Regulations, 1991 and DCPR, 2034 are made for the welfare of the mill workers who have suffered in the strike of textile mills of the year 1982. In the said strike, substantial number of mill workers have lost their jobs and their service dues are also not

paid. Thus, these provisions are made for the purpose of protecting the interest of mill workers and are in the form of welfare policies.

9. As held by the Supreme Court in the case of *Promoters and Builders Association of Pune vs. Pune Municipal Corporation and others*¹, the Development Control Rules are framed by the State Government in exercise of power conferred by Section 158 of the Maharashtra Regional Town Planning Act, 1966 (“**Said Act**”). Consequently they must be treated as if they were in the Act and are to be of the same effect as if contained in the Act and are to be judicially noticed for all purposes of construction and obligation.

10. As far as the welfare legislation is concerned, it is settled legal position that the same is to be construed liberally to advance the object of said welfare legislation. The Supreme Court in the case of *Regional Provident Fund Commissioner vs. Hooghly Mills Company Limited & Ors.*² has discussed the importance of such type of legislation. The relevant discussion is in paragraph Nos.24 to 26, which read as follows:

1 (2007) 6 SCC 143

2 (2012) 2 SCC 489

*“24. If we look at the modern legislative trend we will discern that **there is a large volume of legislation enacted with the purpose of introducing social reform by improving the conditions of certain class of persons who might not have been fairly treated in the past. These statutes are normally called remedial statutes or social welfare legislation,** whereas penal statutes are sometime enacted providing for penalties for disobedience of laws making those who disobey, liable to imprisonment, fine, forfeiture or other penalty.*

25. The normal canon of interpretation is that a remedial statute receives liberal construction whereas a penal statute calls for strict construction. In the cases of remedial statutes, if there is any doubt, the same is resolved in favour of the class of persons for whose benefit the statute is enacted, but in cases of penal statutes if there is any doubt the same is normally resolved in favour of the alleged offender.

26. It is no doubt true that the said Act effectuates the economic message of the Constitution as articulated in the directive principles of State policy. Under the directive principles the State has the obligation for securing just and humane conditions of work which includes a living wage and decent standard of life. The said Act obviously seeks to promote those goals. Therefore, the interpretation of the said Act must not only be liberal but it must be informed by the values of the directive principles. Therefore, an awareness of the social perspective of the Act must guide the interpretative process of the legislative device.”

(Emphasis added)

11. As noted hereinabove, Regulation 58 of the DCR, 1991 and Regulation 35 of the DCPR, 2034 provide that the mill workers who are having residential premises on the mill land are to be given alternate rehab premises on the same land and further provide that other mill workers also shall be rehabilitated *inter alia* by providing rehab premises constructed on the mill land and such premises are to be handed over by the mill owners to the MHADA and the MHADA after conducting lottery shall allot the same to the eligible mill workers. These provisions are made, as mill workers have suffered financially to the great extent in the 1982 strike of the mill workers. As noted hereinabove, the Development Control Rules are framed by the State Government in exercise of powers conferred by Section 158 of the MRTP Act and consequently they must be treated as if they were in the Act and are to be of the same effect as if contained in the Act and are to be judicially noticed for all purposes of construction and obligation. Such type of provisions made, as remedial measures, to rehabilitate the mill workers are required to be construed liberally and to further the object behind the said provisions. The observations in the case of ***Regional Provident Fund Commissioner*** (Supra) are applicable to these provisions made for rehabilitation of the mill workers. Thus, the

approach of the authorities in implementing the said provisions, the purpose of which is to rehabilitate the mill workers is required to be liberal, pragmatic and to safeguard the interest of the mill workers and to ensure their rehabilitation.

12. In the light of the above principles the facts of this case are required to be examined. In this particular case, the Petitioner has been allotted the said premises at Lower Parel, Mumbai, which is very prime locality of Mumbai. Both the learned Counsel state that the market price of the said premises, allotted to the Petitioner as a result of welfare policy to rehabilitate mill workers, is about more than 1 crore. In these circumstances, it is significant to note that the Petitioner who was mill worker and presently aged 76 years has faced tremendous difficulties while collecting the amount of Rs.9,50,000/- and even 10% of the said amount i.e. Rs. 95,000/- within the time as granted by POL dated 03.05.2018.

13. It is required to be noted that the said premises has been allotted to the Petitioner by letter dated 3rd May 2018 and he has been directed to make the payment of 10% amount on or before 16th June 2018 and balance payment of 90% amount has been

directed to be made on or before 15th August 2018. It is required to be noted that the Petitioner's representations filed from time to time as noted earlier for granting extension of time were rejected only on the ground that the time limit is fixed in Provisional Offer Letter dated 3rd May 2018 for payment of 10% of the amount and no extension can be granted for payment of said 10% amount. The said stand is taken by the MHADA Authorities on the basis of the Resolution No.6789 dated 12th October 2018 of the MHADA. However, perusal of the said Resolution clearly shows that the same is applicable to the allottees who have applied to MHADA for purchasing the flats sold by MHADA in the open market by conducting lottery and such flats are allotted to those Applicants/Purchasers in the lottery conducted by MHADA. The said Circular will not strictly apply to the Petitioner.

14. The authorities who are implementing the welfare legislation/scheme to safeguard the interest of marginalized people, shall require to adopt pragmatic approach. In fact, it is necessary that the State of Maharashtra and MHADA should be flexible in this behalf. The Petitioner, who is a mill worker is getting the premises having value of more than 1 crore and he is

even not able to make payment of Rs.95,000/- within a period of 45 days and seeks extension to make the said payment clearly shows the precarious financial condition of the Petitioner. In fact, the said provisions are made in the D.C. Regulations, 1991 and DCPR, 2034 to rehabilitate the mill workers as they are in precarious financial condition. This case, in fact, establishes the need for such welfare measure to rehabilitate the mill workers and also that authorities implementing such welfare measures should adopt liberal approach. With great difficulties, the said amount of Rs.9,50,000/- has been collected by the Petitioner clearly shows the severe financial hardship faced by the Petitioner due to 1982 Cotton Mills strike. The Petitioner is presently aged 76 years old residing in the remote area of State of Maharashtra in Taluka - Gadhinglaj, District - Kolhapur. The State of Maharashtra/MHADA should have taken into consideration hardships which many mill workers like Petitioner have suffered and therefore, while considering the Applications of the persons like Petitioner, more sensitive and liberal approach is required to be adopted.

15. Affidavit-in-reply dated 29th August 2024 has been filed of Mr. Yogesh Mahajan, Deputy Chief Officer of the Respondent No.1-

MHADA. A chart has been annexed to the said affidavit about the interest amount which the Petitioner is liable to pay. As per the said chart, the Petitioner's liability towards interest is Rs.5,42,557/-. Ms. Mangale, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner after taking instructions submitted that the Petitioner will pay said amount of interest within a period of four months. In any case, as set out in the office noting of MHADA on page 46 of the Writ Petition, time can be extended for payment of 90% of the amount for certain period. It is also required to be noted that there is no specific prohibition for the extension of time for 10% of the amount.

16. Accordingly, the following order is passed:

ORDER

- (a) The impugned Order dated 15th October 2019 passed by the Deputy Chief Officer, Dharavi Redevelopment Project/Mill, MHADA, Mumbai, cancelling the allotment of Room No.108, 1st Floor, Building No.1/B, Prakash

Cotton Mill Compound, Lower Parel, Mumbai –
400 013 in favour of the Petitioner is hereby
quashed and set aside;

- (b) It is noted that pursuant to order dated 12th
August 2024 passed by this Court and in terms
of the Provisional Offer Letter dated 3rd May
2018, the Petitioner has already been put in
possession of the said premises on 21.08.2024
as the Petitioner has made payment of
Rs.9,50,000/-;
- (c) The Petitioner is granted four months time to
pay interest amount of Rs.5,42,557/-;
- (d) The Respondents shall take necessary steps
after the Petitioner deposits the said interest
amount with the Respondents to execute
documents for completion of the allotment of
the said premises in favour of the Petitioner.

17. The Writ Petition is allowed in above terms with no order as to costs.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]