

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 1083 OF 2016

Sandeep M. Jagtap .. Petitioner  
vs.  
State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. A. B. Kadam for Petitioner.  
Mrs. V. Nimbalkar - AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

**CORAM : M. S. SONAK, J.**  
**DATE: 25 JANUARY 2016**

**P.C. :-**

1] **Not on board. Upon production, taken on board.**

2] As against the impugned order, assuming without accepting that the same is made in exercise of review jurisdiction, there is remedy by way of revision under Section 257 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 (Code) available to the petitioner. The impugned order states that the same has been made in exercise of the revisional jurisdiction under Section 257 of the Code. Even in such a situation, in terms of the decision of this Court in the case of *Gurudassing Nawoosing Panjwani vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.*<sup>1</sup>, the second revision is maintainable before the State Government under Section 257 of the Code. In fact, the decision of this Court has been upheld by the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Civil Appeal No. 5102 of 2006*.

3] In view of the aforesaid, there is no necessity to entertain the present petition. However, the petitioner is at liberty to avail the alternate statutory remedy available to him under the Code.

---

1 Letters Patent Appeal No. 55 of 2003 against Writ Petition No. 7477 of 2002 decided on 13.07.2005.

4] It is made clear that this Court has not examined merits of the matter and therefore all contentions of all parties are left open. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

5] All concerned to act on basis of authenticated copy of this order.

Chandka

**(M. S. SONAK, J.)**