

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.972 OF 2026

Gram Panchayat Nere through its Sarpanch
Vandana Jalindhar Jadhav and others ... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Maharashtra through Additional Chief
Secretary, Revenue & Forest Department and others ... Respondents

Mr. Abhijit P. Kulkarni a/w. Mr. Abhishek Roy, Mr. Gourav Shahane and Ms. Shweta Shah i/b. Mr. Shreyas Zarkar for Petitioners.

Ms. Neha S. Bhide, Government Pleader a/w. Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for Respondents - State.

Mr. Tushar Sonawane (through VC) for Respondent No.4 - PMRDA.

Dr. Milind Sathe, Senior Advocate a/w. Mr. P. G. Lad and Mr. Muralidharan Kalathil for Respondent No.5 - MHADA.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.**

DATE : JULY 10, 2026

ORDER :

. The petitioner Gram Panchayat has filed this petition seeking setting aside of an order dated 13.06.2025 passed by the respondent No.2 - District Collector, Pune, whereby 4 Hectares 24 Ares land was allotted for the Prime Minister Awas Yojana - 2.0 with a specific project name 'प्रधानमंत्री आवास योजना सर्वासाठी घरे - २०२२'. The said project is hereinafter referred to as 'PMAY - 2.0'. According to the petitioner Gram Panchayat, the said impugned order is in the teeth of the policy of the State and it is in the backdrop of an earlier decision manifested in Minutes of Meeting dated 15.02.2022 conducted in the office of the then Minister, directing allotment of the land to the Gram Panchayat for the benefit of the villagers concerning projects such as public parks, schools, Talathi office, etc. The petitioner Gram Panchayat asserts that the subject land is *Gairan* land, which ought not to be misutilized as per the whims

of the State by ignoring the genuine need of the villagers.

2. The petitioner Nos.2 and 3 are the villagers of the Village Nere. The petitioner Gram Panchayat is also of Village - Nere, Taluka - Mulshi, District - Pune and the petitioners together are seeking further direction for cancelling the aforesaid allotment of land by the impugned order. The reply affidavits filed on behalf of the respondents have placed on record another such order, also of the same date as the impugned order, whereby a further area of 3 Hectares 4 Ares from the said Village - Nere has been allotted for PMAY - 2.0 Scheme. In effect, the petitioners are challenging the aforesaid action of the respondent authorities. The beneficiary of the allotment orders is the respondent No.5 - Maharashtra Housing and Area Development Authority (MHADA), which is to undertake the project of constructing houses for the weaker section under the said PMAY - 2.0 Scheme.

3. The material placed on record by the rival sides shows that on 15.02.2022, a meeting was conducted in the presence of the then Minister for Revenue of the respondent State. The Minutes of Meeting show that a direction was issued to the respondent No.2 Collector and others in the backdrop of a demand made by the petitioner Gram Panchayat for *Gairan* land. It was directed that necessary information be called from the office of the Zilla Parishad, Pune, to ascertain *bona fide* area requirement of the petitioner Gram Panchayat for its proposed projects and to take action as per rules and regulations. It is the case of the petitioner Gram Panchayat that thereafter, it pursued the matter consistently for allotment of land for rural hospital, cultural centre for women, playground, open gymnasium, water tank, higher secondary school, etc. While the petitioner Gram Panchayat was pursuing the matter for the aforesaid projects, it is alleged that suddenly the impugned orders were issued allotting large tracts of 4 Hectares 24 Ares and 3

Hectares 4 Ares from the *Gairan* lands of the said Village Nere for the PMAY - 2.0 Scheme to the respondent No.5 - MHADA.

4. According to the petitioner Gram Panchayat, the said act was arbitrary as it was also pursuing its matter with the State authorities for allotment of *Gairan* land for the purpose of the aforementioned projects concerning the welfare of the villagers in the light of the directions issued by the Minister in the said meeting held on 15.02.2022. The petitioner Gram Panchayat alleges that this sudden change in the approach of the respondent State authorities was attributable to the change in Government and political alignment. It was alleged that the said action of the respondent State authorities was in the teeth of the Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011, which was issued in the backdrop of judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of *Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others*, **(2011) 11 SCC 396**. It was submitted that the consent of the Gram Sabha / Gram Panchayat ought to have been taken before allotting the said lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA. In the absence of consent, such *Gairan* lands could not have been allotted to respondent No.5 - MHADA.

5. On this basis, the petitioner Gram Panchayat filed the present writ petition, wherein notice was issued on 28.01.2026. While issuing notice, this Court made it clear that on the returnable date, the question of interim relief would be considered. In the meanwhile, the respondents took steps for taking physical possession of the said lands and in that backdrop, the petitioner Gram Panchayat pressed for interim relief on 04.03.2026. A statement was made on behalf of the respondent State authorities that possession was taken on 04.03.2026, when this writ petition was listed for consideration. In that light, by order dated 04.03.2026, this Court directed *status-quo* to be maintained with respect to the subject lands, meaning thereby that the respondent authorities

would not deal with the subject lands during the pendency of the writ petition.

6. In this backdrop, the respondents filed their reply affidavits, to which the petitioner Gram Panchayat filed its rejoinder affidavit and in the light of urgency projected on behalf of the respondents, the writ petition was taken up for hearing.

7. Mr. Abhijit Kulkarni, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner Gram Panchayat submitted that although the petitioner was not challenging the authority of the respondent State to deal with the lands, as ultimately the State is the owner of such *Gairan* lands, the real objection was with regard to the manner in which the respondent State exercised power in the present case to allot the subject lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA. It was submitted that the petitioner Gram Panchayat had passed a resolution opposing allotment of the subject lands for any purpose other than the purpose indicated in the Minutes of Meeting dated 15.02.2022 recorded in the Chamber of the then Minister. It was submitted that in the light of the aforesaid resolution of the Gram Panchayat opposing the allotment of lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA, by operation of Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011, the impugned allotments are rendered illegal.

8. It was submitted that the aforesaid Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011 was issued in the light of the observations made by the Supreme Court in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** (*supra*), particularly paragraph 23 thereof. On this basis, it was submitted that the impugned action of the respondent State authorities was against the letter and spirit of the said judgement of the Supreme Court, apart from being arbitrary and unreasonable. It was emphasized that the petitioner Gram Panchayat is a local self-government institution, representing the collective will of the local

villagers and their voice cannot be suppressed, particularly in the light of the fact that a direction was already issued in the said meeting dated 15.02.2022 for taking steps to identify *bona fide* area requirement of the petitioner Gram Panchayat for the said projects of rural hospital, schools and other development projects to be undertaken for the welfare of the local villagers. It was emphasized that even in the report submitted by the Sub-Divisional Officer, annexed to the reply affidavit filed on behalf of respondent No.5 - MHADA, in the 'Other Rights' column of the Revenue Record, the petitioner Gram Panchayat was shown as having rights in the subject lands. The petitioner Gram Panchayat having opposed allotment of land to respondent No. 5 MHADA, the respondent No.2 Collector ought not to have passed the impugned orders. It was submitted that such allotment, not only violated the aforementioned Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011 but also Section 22-A of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 (hereinafter referred to as 'MLRC'). It was emphasized that as per Section 22-A of MLRC introduced by way of amendment with effect from 24.07.2017, *Gairan* land could be diverted for Central Government and State Government projects only if no other suitable piece of Government land was available for the said projects. The said requirement was not satisfied in the present case and hence, it was submitted that the impugned orders of allotment deserved to be set aside.

9. On the other hand, Dr. Milind Sathe, learned Advocate General appearing on behalf of respondent No.5 - MHADA, submitted that the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat are untenable in the face of the provisions of MLRC and particularly, in the light of Section 40 thereof. It was specifically submitted that Section 22-A of MLRC is subject to the wide-ranging power vested with the respondent State under Section 40 thereof with regard to disposal of Government land. The said issue had come up for consideration before

this Court in the case of *Santosh Madhukar Bhondve and others Vs. State of Maharashtra and others* (**judgement and order dated 12.09.2024 passed in Writ Petition No.3098 of 2021**), wherein this Court categorically held that the State had the power and authority to deal with its lands under Section 40 of MLRC and that Section 22-A thereof was not a fetter on the said absolute authority of the State in dealing with its lands.

10. It was submitted that the said judgement of this Court was followed subsequently in judgements and orders passed in the cases of *Group Gram Panchayat Shirdhon and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others* (**judgement and order dated 22.07.2025 passed in PIL No.3 of 2005**) and *Prashant Sunil Kachole and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others* (**judgement and order dated 10.03.2026 passed in Writ Petition No.17617 of 2025**).

11. It was further submitted that the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot rely upon Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011, simply for the reason that the same is merely an executive instruction. Subsequent thereto, in the year 2017, MLRC was amended to add the statutory provision of Section 22-A and it would certainly override the said executive instruction. In any case, in the aforementioned judgements of this Court, the interpretation of Section 22-A in the light of Section 40 of MLRC was already rendered, which was against the position sought to be canvassed on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat. On this basis, it was submitted that the petition deserved to be dismissed.

12. Apart from this, it was submitted that the subject lands belonging to the respondent State are reserved in the regional plan for public housing and on this ground also, the petition deserved to be dismissed. By the impugned orders, the lands have been allotted to respondent No.5 - MHADA for the purpose for which the lands are reserved and

therefore, the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot claim any right therein. It was further submitted that, as per the proposal of the petitioner Gram Panchayat, which was discussed in the said meeting dated 15.02.2022, even the petitioner Gram Panchayat intended to use the *Gairan* land for purposes other than grazing of cattle. In any case, it was submitted that the Minutes of Meeting dated 15.02.2022 did not manifest any crystallized right in favour of the petitioner Gram Panchayat, and therefore, the petition deserved to be dismissed.

13. As regards reliance on judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** (*supra*), it was submitted that in the said case, the Supreme Court was concerned with indiscriminate encroachment of common lands of Gram Panchayats by private parties and rampant misuse of such lands. The facts of the present case are materially different from the case dealt with by the Supreme Court, and therefore, it was submitted that the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot place reliance on the said judgement of the Supreme Court.

14. Ms. Neha Bhide, learned Government Pleader appeared on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2 i.e. the State authorities and supported the contentions raised by the learned Advocate General. Mr. Tushar Sonawane, learned counsel appeared for respondent No.4 - Pune Metropolitan Region Development Authority (PMRDA) and he also supported the contentions raised on behalf of respondent No.5.

15. We have considered the rival submissions. The principal attack on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat on the action of the respondent authorities in allotting the subject lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA, is based on an assertion that the consent of the petitioner Gram Panchayat was necessary before any such allotment of lands could be made. It is urged on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat that the

said assertion is justified by the contents of Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011 and Section 22-A of MLRC. It is further asserted that a direction already having been issued by the concerned Minister in the aforesaid meeting dated 15.02.2022, for undertaking necessary exercise as per Rules for ascertaining *bona fide* area requirement of the petitioner Gram Panchayat for its welfare projects, the respondent No.2 - Collector could not have changed his stand to suddenly allot the subject lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA. This is alleged to be an arbitrary act, smacking of political pressure being used on Government machinery.

16. While considering the said contentions, we are really concerned with the question as to whether the impugned actions of the respondent State authorities can be said to be illegal or unauthorized in any manner. The Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011 was issued in the backdrop of the aforesaid judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** (*supra*). As a matter of fact, the said Government Resolution refers to the said judgement of the Supreme Court. Therefore, it would be appropriate to consider the backdrop in which the Supreme Court rendered the said judgement in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** (*supra*). A perusal of the said judgement shows that the Court was concerned with trespassers, who illegally encroached upon Gram Panchayat lands by using money and muscle power in collusion with Government officials and in some cases even the Gram Panchayat, thereby adversely affecting the rights of villagers in such lands meant for common use. This is evident from the discussion in the said judgement of the Supreme Court, wherein it was observed that the appellants were neither owners nor tenants and that they were rank trespassers in such common lands of the concerned Gram Panchayat. It is in this backdrop that the Supreme Court in its judgement observed as follows:-

“4. What we have witnessed since Independence, however, is that in large parts of the country this common village land has been grabbed by unscrupulous persons using muscle power, money power or political clout, and in many States now there is not an inch of such land left for the common use of the people of the village, though it may exist on paper. People with power and pelf operating in villages all over India systematically encroached upon communal lands and put them to uses totally inconsistent with its original character, for personal aggrandizement at the cost of the village community. This was done with active connivance of the State authorities and local powerful vested interests and goondas. This appeal is a glaring example of this lamentable state of affairs.

* * * * *

6. It is undisputed that the appellants herein are neither the owner nor the tenants of the land in question which is recorded as a pond situated in village Rohar Jagir, Tehsil and District Patiala. They are in fact trespassers and unauthorized occupants of the land relating Khewat Khatuni No. 115/310, Khasra No. 369 (84-4) in the said village. They appear to have filled in the village pond and made constructions thereon.

* * * * *

13. We find no merit in this appeal. The appellants herein were trespassers who illegally encroached on to the Gram Panchayat land by using muscle power/money power and in collusion with the officials and even with the Gram Panchayat. We are of the opinion that such kind of blatant illegalities must not be condoned. Even if the appellants have built houses on the land in question they must be ordered to remove their constructions, and possession of the land in question must be handed back to the Gram Panchayat. Regularizing such illegalities must not be permitted because it is Gram Sabha land which must be kept for the common use of villagers of the village.”

17. Perusal of the above-quoted paragraphs of the said judgement of the Supreme Court clearly shows that the thrust of the observations was against private parties rampantly and illegally trespassing into the common lands belonging to the Gram Panchayat. In this backdrop, the following direction was issued by the Supreme Court in the said judgement in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab**

and others (*supra*):-

“23. Before parting with this case we give directions to all the State Governments in the country that they should prepare schemes for eviction of illegal/unauthorized occupants of Gram Sabha / Gram Panchayat / Poramboke / Shamlat land and these must be restored to the Gram Sabha / Gram Panchayat for the common use of villagers of the village. For this purpose the Chief Secretaries of all State Governments/Union Territories in India are directed to do the needful, taking the help of other senior officers of the Governments. The said scheme should provide for the speedy eviction of such illegal occupant, after giving him a show cause notice and a brief hearing. Long duration of such illegal occupation or huge expenditure in making constructions thereon or political connections must not be treated as a justification for condoning this illegal act or for regularizing the illegal possession. Regularization should only be permitted in exceptional cases e.g. where lease has been granted under some Government notification to landless labourers or members of Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, or where there is already a school, dispensary or other public utility on the land.”

18. The Government Resolution dated 12.07.2011 was issued in the backdrop of the said judgment. A perusal of the same shows that even in the said judgement, enough scope was left for utilizing such *Gairan* lands for Central Government and State Governments Schemes of public utility and public purpose. In the context of utilization of *Gairan* land for such purpose, it was stipulated that a consent resolution of the Gram Sabha / Gram Panchayat should be obtained. The said Government Resolution has operated in the backdrop of the observations made by the Supreme Court in the aforementioned judgement in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (*supra*)**. But, it is specifically contended by the learned Advocate General that the said Government Resolution, being an executive instruction, has been superseded by insertion of Section 22-A in MLRC by amendment with effect from 26.04.2017. It is asserted that in the face of the statutory provision being inserted, *Gairan* lands can certainly be utilized for public purpose and public projects of the Central Government and State

Governments, as also statutory authorities. In this backdrop, it would be appropriate to refer to Section 22-A of MLRC, which reads as follows:-

“22A. Prohibition on diversion of use of Gairan Land.— (1)

The land set apart by the Collector for free pasturage of village cattle (hereinafter referred to as “the Gairan Land”) shall not be diverted, granted or leased for any other use, except in the circumstances provided in sub-sections (2) or (3), as the case may be.

(2) The Gairan land may be diverted, granted or leased for a public purpose or public project of the Central Government or the State Government or any statutory authority or any public authority or undertaking under the Central Government or the State Government (hereinafter in this section referred to as “Public Authority”), if no other suitable piece of Government land is available for such public purpose or public project.

(3) The Gairan land may be diverted, granted or leased for a project of a project proponent, not being a Public Authority, when such Gairan land is unavoidably required for such project and such project proponent transfers to the State Government, compensatory land as provided in sub-sections (4) and (5).

(4) The compensatory land to be transferred to the State Government under sub-section (3) shall be in the same revenue village have area equal to twice the area of the Gairan land and its value shall not be less than the value of the Gairan land so allotted under sub-section (3) :

Provided that, the area of compensatory land shall have to be suitably increased, wherever necessary, so as to make its value equal to the value of the Gairan land so allotted under sub-section (3).

(5) The compensatory land to be transferred to the State Government under sub-section (3) shall, notwithstanding anything contained in any other law, rule or orders made thereunder, be assigned by the Collector under section 22 for the use only of free pasturage of village cattle or for grass or fodder reserve.

(6) The powers of diversion, grant, lease of Gairan land under this section shall be vested in the State Government :

Provided that, notwithstanding anything contained in section 330A, the powers of the State Government under sub-section (3) shall not be delegated to any officer or other authority sub-ordinate to it.

(7) Notwithstanding anything in sub-sections (1) to (6) or any other provision of this Act, Gram Sabhas shall be competent to preserve, safeguard and manage Gairan land in Scheduled Areas ;

Provided that, no Gairan land in the Scheduled Areas shall be diverted or disposed of without the prior informed consent of the Gram Sabhas concerned.”

19. A perusal of the above-quoted provision does indicate that *Gairan* lands can be diverted towards public purpose and public projects of the Central Government, State Government and statutory authorities. There are certain stipulations engrafted in the said provision, including a requirement to examine as to whether no other suitable piece of Government land is available for the proposed public purpose and the Scheme of the Central / State Government. The insistence of the petitioner Gram Panchayat that its consent resolution was a *sine qua non* for allotment of land to respondent No.5 - MHADA for construction of houses for weaker section, does not appear to be supported by the statutory scheme.

20. In any case, we find that a Division Bench of this Court considered the issue of interplay between Section 22-A of MLRC and Section 40 thereof in the case of **Santosh Madhukar Bhondve and others Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*). At this stage, it would be appropriate to refer to Section 40 of MLRC, which reads as follows:-

“40. Saving of powers of Government.— Nothing contained in any provision of this Code shall derogate from the right of the State Government to dispose of any land, the property of Government, on such terms and conditions as it deems fit.”

21. In the said judgement of this Court in the case of **Santosh Madhukar Bhondve and others Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*), much emphasis was placed on the words ‘nothing contained in any provision of this Code’ used in the above-quoted Section 40 of

MLRC. In that context, this Court made the following observations:-

“24. Section 40 of the MLRC, 1966 as extracted above, vests almost absolute right in the State Government to dispose of any land or property of the Government on such terms and conditions as it deems fit. The language in which Section 40 is couched leaves no room of doubt that the right of the State Government to dispose of any of its land or property is irrespective of any provision of MLRC, 1966 for the reason of opening phrase occurring in Section 40 is ‘nothing contained in any provision of this Code’. Thus, we are of the opinion that by operation of Section 40 of the MLRC, 1966, the State Government is vested with right to dispose of any land of the Government on such terms and conditions which are to be determined by it irrespective of any other provision available in MLRC, 1966 including Section 22A. Such, an interpretation of Section 40 qua Section 22A of the MLRC, 1966 is based on the rationale that the Government is the absolute owner of its own property and land and hence, putting any fetter on the right of the Government to dispose of any property on the terms and conditions to be determined by it, in our opinion, will not be permissible and therefore, in the view of the Court, notwithstanding the prohibition contained in Section 22A of the MLRC, 1966, the Government still will have all the authority and power to dispose of its land.”

22. This position was followed in the subsequent judgements of this Court in the cases of **Group Gram Panchayat Shirdhon and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*) and **Prashant Sunil Kachole and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*). The judgements in the cases of **Santosh Madhukar Bhondve and others Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*) and **Prashant Sunil Kachole and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (*supra*) specifically concerned allotment of land for construction of houses under the *Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana*. Thus, we find that on similar facts, in the said judgements, this Court rejected contentions similar to those raised on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat in the present case.

23. In this backdrop, we find that the respondent State was well

within its powers to invoke Section 40 of MLRC, while issuing the impugned order allotting lands to respondent No.5 - MHADA for construction of houses for weaker section. The impugned orders dated 13.06.2025 allotting such lands specifically invoked Section 40 of MLRC. Hence, we do not find any substance in the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat, including the contention that the 'Other Rights' column in the Revenue Record shows the name of the petitioner Gram Panchayat in the context of the subject lands. It is undisputed that the respondent State is the owner of the said lands and therefore, merely because in the 'Other Rights' column, the name of the petitioner Gram Panchayat is mentioned, cannot take its case any further.

24. Apart from this, it is also undisputed that in the regional plan, the subject lands are reserved for 'public housing'. Therefore, the respondent State by allotting the subject lands to respondent No.5 MHADA for construction of houses for weaker section, has ensured utilization of the said lands for the purpose for which they are reserved. We also find that the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot claim any crystallized right merely on the basis of the Minutes of Meeting dated 15.02.2022, recorded in the Chamber of the then Revenue Minister. The said document only shows that a direction was issued for ascertaining the *bona fide* area requirement of the Gram Panchayat for its projects as per Rules and to take further action in the matter. Therefore, the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot claim any vested right in the lands in question.

25. We are also unable to agree with the petitioner Gram Panchayat that the impugned action of the respondent State is against the letter and spirit of the judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of **Jagpal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** (*supra*), for the reason that in the said case, the Supreme Court was dealing with rank

trespassers in common lands of the Gram Panchayat, who had rampantly misused the common land for private benefit by making illegal and unauthorized constructions. The said case is clearly distinguishable on facts, and therefore, the petitioner Gram Panchayat cannot claim any support from the said judgement for its contentions.

26. The documents on record also do not show any procedural illegality on the part of the respondent authorities in making the allotment in favour of respondent No.5 - MHADA and we are in agreement of the specific contention raised on behalf of the respondent MHADA that the proposed construction does subserve public purpose. It is undisputed that the allotment of lands has been made for a Central Government Scheme i.e. PMAY - 2.0 Scheme for constructing houses for economically weaker sections of the society and hence, the statutory requirement under Section 22-A of MLRC is also duly satisfied.

27. In view of the above, we do not find any merit in the present petition and accordingly, it is dismissed. The interim order is vacated.

28. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

29. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner Gram Panchayat prayed for extending the interim order for a specific period of time, but, considering the reasons recorded in this order while dismissing the Writ Petition, we are not inclined to grant the prayer. Accordingly, the prayer is rejected.

30. The learned counsel for the petitioner Gram Panchayat submitted that this Court may consider directing the respondent authorities to consider the proposal for specific projects as indicated in the documents on record. The learned Advocate General submits that if a fresh representation is made on behalf of the petitioner Gram Panchayat, it can be considered in accordance with law.

31. Accordingly, the petitioner Gram Panchayat is granted liberty to make a representation, which shall be decided by the respondent State authorities in accordance with the law.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

Minal Parab