Case Reference Report

Query: Simplify this legal document for a layperson. Add IPC/Acts, prominent cases and compare verdict outc

Prominent Matches

1. uploads/finalhack9.pdf | 0.83

    Snippet: WITH

    WRIT PETITION NO.9603 OF 2018

    Lalbihari Jhingai Prajapati
    ...Petitioner

    Vs.

    Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation & Ors.
    ...Respondents

    WITH

    WRIT PETITION NO.10159 OF 2018

    Prashant Vilas Jadhav

2. uploads/finalhack9.pdf | 0.81

    Snippet: Rakesh Co. Op . Hgs. Soc. Ltd. Through ... vs Ulhasnagar

    Municipal Corp. Through The ... on 5 October, 2018

    Author: G.S. Kulkarni

    Bench: Naresh H. Patil, G.S. Kulkarni

    1

    904-wp 9602-18@ors.doc

    psv

    IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

    CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

3. uploads/finalhack9.pdf | 0.67

    Snippet: kesh Co-op. Hsg. Soc. Ltd.
    ...Petitioner

    Vs.

    Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation & Ors.
    ...Respondents

    WITH

    WRIT PETITION NO.10161 OF 2018

    Surender Gupta
    ...Petitioner

    Vs.

    Ul

AI Analysis

1. Overview/Meaning:

This legal document summarizes a Bombay High Court case (Rakesh Co. Op. Hgs. Soc. Ltd. & Ors. v. Ulhasnagar Municipal Corp. & Ors., 2018) involving multiple petitions challenging the Ulhasnagar Municipal Corporation's planned demolition of several structures. The petitioners argued that the demolitions were unlawful due to lack of proper notice, failure to follow due process under the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 (MRTP Act), and insufficient proof of ownership by the corporation. The court ultimately dismissed the petitions.

2. IPC Codes/Acts/Amendments/Sections:

* **Article 226 of the Indian Constitution:** This article grants the High Courts the power to issue writs (orders) for the enforcement of fundamental rights and other legal rights. The petitioners used this article to challenge the municipal corporation's actions.

* **Section 126 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 (MRTP Act):** This section likely deals with the procedures for acquiring land for public purposes, a key point of contention in the case.