INDIALAW



ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION | FAMILY LAW | REAL ESTATE

Bombay High Court Balances Redevelopment Rights with Possessory Protection in Matrimonial Dispute: Ritesh Haldar v. Elite Housing LLP

AUTHOR Supriya Bhosale, Riddhi Agarwal

PUBLISHED 9 July 2025

Introduction

In a significant ruling balancing redevelopment right with possessory and matrimonial protections, the Bombay High Court in Ritesh Haldar & Anr. v. Elite Housing LLP & Ors. clarified that a redevelopment process cannot be used to displace individuals in lawful possession of premises without ownership without due legal process. The case revolved around competing claims to a flat undergoing redevelopment, highlighting the intersection of matrimonial rights, property possession, and redevelopment logistics.

Background

The dispute centers around Flat No.12 in the 'Spectrum' building, Khar (W), Mumbai, which is being redeveloped by Elite Housing LLP. The Haldar family includes three brothers, Ritesh, Rohitesh, and Rajesh. Leena, the wife of Rohitesh, resides in the flat with her children and asserts it as her matrimonial home, although she does not claim legal ownership.

Ritesh claimed ownership of the flat and was willing to hand over possession to the developer. He stated that Leena and Rohitesh occupied the flat as gratuitous licensees. However, Leena opposed redevelopment, claiming a right to remain in possession and to receive compensation under the redevelopment arrangement.

The developer required execution of a Permanent Alternate Accommodation Agreement (PAAA) and possession of the flat for demolition. The Single Judge of the Bombay High Court allowed the developer to proceed with redevelopment via the Court Receiver and directed that Leena be paid transit rent and handed possession of the redeveloped flat upon completion.

Aggrieved by this arrangement, Ritesh and Rohitesh filed separate appeals under Section 37 of the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

Issues Before the Court

The Division Bench was called upon to decide:

- Whether the redevelopment process could be used to displace Leena without a formal eviction decree?
- Who should receive transit rent and alternate accommodation during redevelopment?
- In whose name should the PAAA be executed and who should receive the hardship compensation?

Court's Observations

The Court carefully examined the competing claims. While Ritesh was recorded as the flat owner in the housing society's records, Leena was in undisputed possession of the premises with her two children. She did not assert ownership but claimed residence as her matrimonial right.

The Court reaffirmed that redevelopment cannot substitute or override formal eviction procedures. Since Leena was described even by Ritesh as a gratuitous licensee, the only lawful way to evict her was by securing a decree from a competent court. Ongoing redevelopment could not be used to remove her from possession. The Court noted that Ritesh had already initiated an eviction suit in the Court of Small Causes.

The Court relied on precedents such as Vipul Fatehchand Shah v. Nav Samir CHS and Harshad Shah v. Labharti Realties, reiterating that the person in actual possession of a flat at the time of redevelopment is entitled to transit rent and must be restored to possession of the redeveloped flat. These rights flow from occupation, not ownership.

At the same time, the Court acknowledged Ritesh's legal status as the recorded owner and held that the PAAA must be executed in his name, and that he should receive the hardship compensation (corpus), subject to any claims by his brothers. However, this did not affect Leena's possessory rights.

The Court also modified the Single Judge's order directing execution of the agreement through the Court Receiver, holding that such a step was unwarranted in the absence of any pending litigation challenging ownership.

The Court endorsed a dual-track approach, recognizing Ritesh's rights as legal owner for purposes of contractual execution and compensation, while protecting Leena's possessory rights during and after redevelopment. Leena would continue receiving transit rent during construction and would be handed possession of the redeveloped flat (Flat No.801) upon completion, subject

to the outcome of the eviction suit.

Final Directions

The Court modified the Single Judge's order. It directed that the PAAA should be executed in Ritesh's name, not in the name of the Court Receiver. This execution, as well as payment of hardship compensation and other redevelopment-related amounts (except transit rent and brokerage), would be subject to any competing claims of ownership from other family members. Transit rent and brokerage would be paid to Leena from the date she vacates Flat No.12 until the date she receives possession of the redeveloped flat. The developer was instructed to hand over possession of the redeveloped flat, Flat No.801, to Leena immediately upon it becoming available for occupation. However, her continued stay would remain subject to the outcome of the eviction proceedings initiated by Ritesh. Lastly, Leena was required to vacate Flat No.12 within four weeks of receiving a written notice from the developer. The appeal filed by Ritesh was partly allowed, while Rohitesh's appeal was dismissed.

Conclusion

This judgment upholds the sanctity of lawful possession in redevelopment situations and reinforces that eviction must be pursued only through proper legal channels. While Ritesh's ownership entitles him to compensation and contractual rights, Leena's possession ensures her right to alternate accommodation and protection during redevelopment. The Court struck a thoughtful and equitable balance between competing legal and human consideration preserving ownership without undermining possessory protection.

For further details, contact us at: contact@indialaw.in

Related Practice Areas

Property & Real Estate Advisory | Family Law Dispute | Real Estate | Arbitration