

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 683 OF 2015
IN WP/3615/2015

WITH

CP/684/2015 IN WP/3612/2015 WITH CP/687/2015 IN WP/3614/2015 WITH
CP/688/2015 IN WP/3630/2015 WITH CP/689/2015 IN WP/3611/2015 WITH
CP/690/2015 IN WP/3613/2015

SALASAR DEVELOPERS
VERSUS
SHRI ANANT J. SHETE AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. D. S. Bagul.
AGP for Respondents : Mr. A. B. Girase.

. . .

CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
A. M. BADAR, JJ.

DATE : 22nd FEBRUARY, 2016.

PER COURT:

1] Mr. Bagul, learned counsel submits that this Court vide order dated 1st April, 2015, had directed the respondent No.1 to take decision on the application tendered by the present petitioners/purchasers seeking permission under section 36-A of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, within 6 months. Same has not been taken. According to learned counsel, initially the Collector had illegally rejected the applications. Subsequently, after notices issued by this Court, the Collector has again issued notices and statements are recorded.

2] Mr. Girase, learned Govt. Pleader, submits that, in fact, in one of the matters, concerned tribal had made a statement that he is not ready

for selling the land and as such, report was submitted by the Collector to the Divisional Commissioner, who, in turn, had submitted it to the concerned Minister. Subsequently, same of the tribal appeared and made statement that now they are ready for sale of the said property and as such, the Collector has conducted enquiry and recorded the statement.

3] Mr. Bagul submits that in all these matters, the Collector has recorded statements. Be that as it may, even as per the petitioners statements are again recorded by the Collector, who in turn, will submit it to the Division Commissioner or the Honourable Minister, as the case may be. Same shall be done expeditiously, preferably within 3 months. Contempt petitions are accordingly disposed of.

[A.M. BADAR]
JUDGE

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

grt/-