

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 1010 OF 2017

GUIDO DE LOYOLA FURTADO @ JOSE
INACIO GUIDO DE LOYOLA FURTADO., ... Petitioner

Versus

THE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AND 15
ORS., ... Respondents

Mr. J. Ceolho Pereira, Senior Advocate with Adv. Ms. I. Sayed
for the Petitioner.

Coram:- C. V. BHADANG, J.

Date:- 6th December 2017

P.C.:

On hearing Mr. Pereira, the learned Senior Counsel for the
Petitioner I do not find that any case for interference is made out.

2. A declaration of mudkarship of a dwelling house to the extent
of 400 sq.mtrs was granted to now deceased Satyabama. The
private respondents are the legal representatives of Satyabama.
The Additional Collector, North Goa had allowed the appeal
filed by the petitioner and set aside the order of declaration, but
the order was restored by the Administrative Tribunal. The said
order of the Administrative Tribunal is subject matter of
challenge at the instance of the petitioner in W.P. No.112/2016.

3. The present petition arises out of the demarcation proceedings. The Inspector of Survey and Land Records by an order dated 7/1/2000 had confirmed the property surveyed under Chalta no.85 and 119 of P.T.S. Sheet 62 of Panaji City admeasuring 250 sq.mtrs. and 202 sq.mtrs.,respectively, in the name of the private respondents. The said order has been confirmed by the Director of Settlement and Land Records and subsequently by the Administrative Tribunal by impugned judgment and order dated 29/2/2016. Considering the fact that the said demarcation/confirmation proceedings are based on the order granting declaration of mundkarial rights, no case for interference is made out. The petition is accordingly dismissed. However, it is made clear that the demarcation, allotment of separate chalta number and the confirmation shall be subject to the outcome of W. P. No.112/2016.

C. V. BHADANG, J.

ap/-