

Mr. R.J. Nirmal advocate for the petitioners
Mr. P.S. Patil, AGP for Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.6246 OF 2016

Aditya S/o Sudam Jadhav

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

Respondents

Mr. R.J. Nirmal advocate for the petitioners
Mr. V.M. Kagne, AGP for Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.6247 OF 2016

Shobhabai w/o Sakharam Jadhav & another

Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

Respondents

Mr. R.J. Nirmal advocate for the petitioners
Mr. M.B, Bharaswadkar, AGP for Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.6248 OF 2016

Mankarnabai w/o Pandharinath Wagh

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

Respondents

Mr. R.J. Nirmal advocate for the petitioner
Mr. A.R. Kale, AGP for Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.6249 OF 2016

Bhikaji S/o Vithal Jadhav

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

Respondents

Mr. R.J. Nirmal advocate for the petitioner
Mr. S.S. Dandel, AGP for Respondents.

CORAM : R.M. BORDE &
K.L.WADANE, JJ

(Date : 16th June, 2016.)

PER COURT :-

1 Learned AGP appearing for the State, on instructions from Nayab Tahsildar, Aundhanagnath, Mr. Vaijnath Bhalerao, who is present in person in the Court, states that till today action has not been initiated against the petitioners and no notice has been issued to them. It is further submitted that the enquiry about the Wakf property in Aundha Nagnath is not conducted till today. After conducting an enquiry if the names of the petitioners are found recorded in respect of wakf property, then after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, appropriate action would be taken. It is further stated that the respondent No.5 filed suo-motu Appeal before the respondent No.4 challenging the order dated 8.12.2005 passed by the then Tahsildar, Aundha directing cancellation of the revenue entry of restricted ownership vide Mutation Entry No.502. In the said Appeal, an application for condonation of delay was filed and the said application was allowed by respondent No.4 by order dated 19.3.2016 and the Appeal is pending for disposal

before respondent No.4.

2 Since it has been contended that no action is yet initiated and that no action adverse to the interest of the petitioner would be taken without observing principles of natural justice, the grievances raised by the petitioners in the instant petitions stand redressed.

3 All the petitions stand disposed of.

(K.L.WADANE, J)

(R.M.BORDE, J)

vbd