

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

**NOTICE OF MOTION NO.223 OF 2018  
IN  
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.119 OF 2009**

JANHIT MANCH & Ors.

**...Petitioners**

**versus**

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

**...Respondents**

.....

Mr.Bhagvanji Raiyani, petitioner in person.

Mr.Abhay Patki, Addl. GP with Ms.Uma Palsuledesai, AGP for  
State/Respondent Nos.1, 3 & 4.

.....

**CORAM :- DIPANKAR DATTA, CJ &  
G. S. KULKARNI, J.**

**DATE :- JANUARY 27, 2021.**

**PC :**

1. The concern expressed in this PIL petition is neatly encapsulated in the order of the co-ordinate bench of this Court dated October 30, 2015 and hence we refrain from adverting thereto. We find from such order that a survey was directed to be carried out in a phase-wise manner of the allotments made in all the schemes of the Slum Rehabilitation Authority (hereafter "the SRA", for short) with a view to ascertain whether transfers have been made by the allottees within the restricted (lock-in) period of 10 years and also as to whether transfers have been effected after such period of 10 years, but without obtaining the permission of the SRA. Such steps were required to be reported by filing an affidavit by December 4, 2015.

2. There is an affidavit dated December 9, 2015, of the Chief Executive Officer of the SRA, only to the effect that an agency has been identified and appointed for conducting survey in line with the directions contained in the order dated October 30, 2015. However, what the survey report is and what steps have been taken in pursuance thereof to address the concern of the petitioners expressed in this PIL petition are conspicuous by its absence.

3. We require the Chief Executive Officer of the SRA, to file a further affidavit within four weeks from date giving full particulars of action taken against the errant allottees.

4. The PIL petition shall be listed once again on **March 10, 2021**.

5. The petitioner no.2, appearing in person, has submitted that he may not be available to argue the PIL petition in Court on the next date physically, because of his advanced age. It would be open to the petitioners to make such arrangement for addressing the bench as and when the PIL petition is taken up for hearing next. The petitioners shall also be at liberty to file written submission.

**(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)**

**(CHIEF JUSTICE)**