

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA.
(LD-VC-CW-140/2020)**

Lakkawa Karishetty Thr. Her
Lawful Attorney Balram Karishetty ...Petitioner

Vs

Dy. Commissioner, Corporation
of the City of Panaji, and anr. ...Respondents

Shri J. Godinho, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri A. Bhobe, Advocate for the respondent no.1.
Shri V. Fernandes, Advocate for the respondent no.2.

Coram:- DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

Date:23rd October 2020.

PC.

Faced with an order of demolition, the petitioner has come to this Court. The petitioner's principal grievance is that the authorities' has not put her on notice before their passing the impugned order. To elaborate, the petitioner maintains that the authorities served notice on someone else than the petitioner herself.

2. In response to the submission advanced by the petitioner's counsel Shri Joaquim Godinho, the learned counsel for the first respondent, Shri Ashwin Bhobe, submits that the authorities have followed the law and passed the order. Therefore, the matter calls for no interference.

3. Shri Violent Fernandes holding for Shri S. Mahambrey, the learned counsel for the second respondent, supports the first respondent.

4. At any rate, either respondent has affirmed that the petitioner has been put on notice. Once the principles of natural justice have been breached, the order renders itself void.

5. Under these circumstances, I set aside the impugned order and leave it open for the first respondent to issue a notice to the petitioner and

proceed further with the matter under the law. Thus, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

If the petitioner's application is pending before the second respondent on any aspect, that authority will consider it as well, as per the law.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

vn*