

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 9492 OF 2013

Tukaram Appa Khetmalis through
L.Rs. Gautam Tukaram Khetmalis .. Petitioners

Versus

The Collector Revenue Ahmednagar
and another .. Respondents

Shri P. M. Shah, Senior Advocate i/by Smt. Anjali Dube (Bajpai),
Advocate for Petitioners.

Ms. S. S. Raut, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri R. N. Dhorde, Senior Advocate i/by Shri V. R. Dhorde,
Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 9493 of 2013**

Bhausahab Parwati Khetmalis
and others .. Petitioners

Versus

The Collector Revenue Ahmednagar
and another .. Respondents

Shri P. M. Shah, Senior Advocate i/by Smt. Anjali Dube (Bajpai),
Advocate for Petitioners.

Ms. S. S. Raut, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri R. N. Dhorde, Senior Advocate i/by Shri V. R. Dhorde,
Advocate for the Respondent No. 1.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
K. K. SONAWANE, JJ.
DATE : 04TH JULY, 2016.**

PER COURT :

. Present petitions are filed seeking directions against the Collector to decide applications dated 30th December, 2010 (Exhibit - D) purportedly filed under the provisions of the Maharashtra Revenue Patels (Abolition of Office) Act, 1962.

2. We have heard Mr. Shah, the learned senior advocate for petitioners and Mr. Dhorde, the learned senior advocate for the respondent No. 2/sanstha.

3. The learned senior advocates for both the parties have canvassed submissions with regard to maintainability and non maintainability of the said applications. We need not go into the details of the same, as the learned Assistant Government Pleader states that, the Additional Collector, Ahmednagar has intimated the A. G. P. that, pursuant to the applications dated 30th December, 2010 filed by present petitioners, the Sub Divisional Officer Shrigonda-Parner has stated that, as there was some deficiency in the report submitted by the S. D. O. Shrigonda-Parner, the same has been sent back and as per rules further enquiry would be conducted immediately on the application of the petitioners.

4. In view of the said statement made, no orders are necessary to be passed.

5. Needless to state, the contentions of the respective parties are kept open and that the authority is required to consider all the relevant aspects of the matter. The writ petitions as such are disposed of. No costs.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/July 16