

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10985 OF 2014

Manohar Hendar Chenekar .. Petitioner
VS.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

None for Petitioner.

Ms M. S. Bane - 'B' Panel Counsel for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

Mr. Rohit P. Sakhadeo for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

Mr. S. G. Karandikar for Respondent No. 13.

CORAM : M. S. SONAK, J.

DATE: 24 NOVEMBER 2015

P.C. :-

1] None for the Petitioner. However, rather than dismiss the petition for non prosecution, it would be appropriate if this petition is disposed of on the ground that the Petitioner has alternate and efficacious remedy available as against the impugned order.

2] This Court in the case of *Gurudassing N. Panjwani vs. The State of Maharashtra*¹ has held that under the Scheme of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, a revision application under Section 257 is maintainable even against an order earlier made by the Authority subordinate to the State Government in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. In terms of this ruling, therefore, as against

¹ Letters Patent Appeal No. 55 of 2003 dated 13 July 2005.

the impugned order, remedy of revision will lie to the State Government.

3] Accordingly, this petition is not entertained. However, liberty is granted to the Petitioner to avail of the revisional remedy.

4] With the aforesaid observations, this petition is disposed of.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)

Chandka