

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

(1) WRIT PETITION NO.4258 OF 2018

Dhannu s/o Vitthal Phapal,  
age: 28 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Belura, Tq. Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through the Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
- 02 The Collector, Beed.
- 03 The Deputy Collector, Beed.
- 04 The Tehsildar, Majalgaon,  
Tehsil Office, Majalgaon,  
Tq. Majalgaon, District Beed.

Mr.S.G.Dodya, advocate with Mr.P.N.Mule, advocate for the  
petitioner.  
Mr.P.N.Kutti, A.G.P. for Respondents.

(2) WRIT PETITION NO. 5124 OF 2018

Maruti S/o Ratanrao Ghugre  
age 34 years, occ. business  
R/o Behind Morya Super Shoppe,  
Ambad, Taluka Ambad,  
District Jalna

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

- 02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Jalna.
- 03 The Deputy Collector /  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
Ambad, Taluka Ambad,  
District Jalna
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Ambad  
Taluka Ambad, District Jalna Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(3) WRIT PETITION NO. 5265 OF 2018

Sunil s/o Hiranman Pawar  
Age 32 years, occ. Agril. & Business,  
R/o. Salapuri,  
Tq. & Dist. Parbhani Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.
- 03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth  
Dist. Parbhani Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. A.B. Girase, G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(4) WRIT PETITION NO. 5266 OF 2018

Raichand s/o Harischandra Phad  
Age 33 years, Occ. Agril & Business  
R/o Kanerwadi, Tq. Parali(Vaij).  
Tq. Ambajogai, Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. A.B. Girase, G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(5) WRIT PETITION NO. 5267 OF 2018

Jagdish s/o Manikrao Phad,  
Age 32 years, Occ. Agri. & Business,  
R/o T.P.S. Road, Shivaji Nagar,  
Parali Vaijinath, Tq. Parali Vaijinath  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary

in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth  
Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. A.B. Girase, G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(6) WRIT PETITION NO. 5268 OF 2018

Anant s/o Balasaheb Mundhe  
Age 35 years, Occ. Agril. & Business,  
R/o Tokwadi, Tq. Parli,  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Pathri, Tq. Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. A.B. Girase, GP for respondents.

WITH  
(7) WRIT PETITION NO.5269 OF 2018

Ramchandra s/o Udhavrao Lahane  
Age 42 years, Occ. Agril. & Business,  
R/o Makegaon, Tq. Renapur,  
Dist. Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth Tq. Sonpeth,  
Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. A.B. Girase, G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(8) WRIT PETITION NO. 5270 OF 2018

Balasaheb s/o Uttamrao Chate  
Age 48 years, Occ. Agril. & Business,  
R/o Chukar Pimpari,  
Tq. Sonpeth, Dist. Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra

Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. A.B. Girase, G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(9) WRIT PETITION NO. 5366 OF 2018

Suryakant s/o Deorao Bhore  
Age 32 years, Occ. Agriculture  
R/o Bramhan Galli, Wadwani,  
Tq. Wadwani, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary,  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Beed.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
Wadwani, Taluka Wadwani  
District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,

Tahsil Office, Wadwani,  
Taluka Wadwani, District Beed.

Respondents

Mr. A.B.Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(10) WRIT PETITION NO. 5369 OF 2018

Balasaheb S/o Kondiba Ughade  
Age 48 years, Occ. Driver,  
R/o Babhali, Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary,  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector, Parbhani  
Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Parbhani, Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar Parbhani,  
Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. M.P. Kale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(11) WRIT PETITION NO. 5440 OF 2018

Baliram S/o Dagdoba Navghare  
Age 41 years, Occ. Agril. & Business,  
R/o Mudgal,, Tq. Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Parbhani
- 03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth Tq. Sonpeth  
Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for the State.

WITH  
(12) WRIT PETITION NO. 5441 OF 2018

Vinayak S/o Baburao Kendre  
Age 33 years, Occ. Agri. & Business  
R/o Mudgal, Tq. Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Parbhani
- 03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani



04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(13) WRIT PETITION NO. 5495 OF 2018

Umakant S/o Bhagwanrao Gaikwad  
Age 30 years, Occ. Agril.  
R/o Nitrud, Tq. Majalgaon,  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector,  
Parbhani, Dist. Parbhani

03 The Additional Collector,  
Parbhani, Dist. Parbhani

04 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Pathari, Tq. Pathari  
Dist. Parbhani

05 The Tahsildar,  
Pathari, Tq. Pathari  
Dist. Parbhani

06 The Circle Inspector,  
Hadgaon, Tq. Pathari  
Tq. Pathari, Dist. Parbhani

07 The Police Inspector,

Police Station, Pathari  
Tq. Pathari, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. S.K. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(14) WRIT PETITION NO. 5507 OF 2018

Govind s/o Mahadeo Tidke  
Age 29 years, Occ. Agril.  
R/o Chinch Wadgaon, Tq. Wadwani  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue & Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
- 02 The District Collector,  
Parbhani, District Parbhani.
- 03 The Additional Collector,  
Parbhani, District Parbhani.
- 04 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Pathri, Tq. Pathri,  
District Parbhani.
- 05 The Tahsildar,  
Pathri, Tq. Pathri,  
District Parbhani.
- 06 The Circle Inspector,  
Hadgaon, Tq. Pathari,  
District Parbhani.
- 07 The Police Inspector,

Police Station, Pathari,  
Tq.Pathari, District  
Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.K.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents no.1 to 7.

WITH  
(15) WRIT PETITION NO.6839 OF 2018

Baburao s/o Ramarao Birajdar,  
age: 57 years, Occ: Agri.,  
R/o Killari, Tq. Ausa, Dist.Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad.
- 03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad.
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Omerga,  
Tq.Omerga, Dist.Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr.L.C.Patil, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(16) WRIT PETITION NO.6840 OF 2018

Bhalchandra s/o Mahadeo Khobre,  
age: 48 years, Occ: Agri.,  
R/o Nadi-Hatarga, Nilanga,  
District Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad.
- 03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad.
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Omerga,  
Tq.Omerga, Dist.Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr.L.C.Patil, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH

(17) WRIT PETITION NO.6841 OF 2018

Ravindra s/o Chandrakant Lamture,  
age: 60 years, Occ: Agri.,  
R/o Kukalgaon, Tq. Nilanga,  
Dist.Osmanabad.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad.
- 03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad.
- 04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Omerga,  
Tq.Omerga, Dist.Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr.L.C.Patil, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(18) WRIT PETITION NO.6842 OF 2018

Balaji s/o Revanappa Waghmode,  
age: 36 years, Occ: Agri.,  
R/o Kunali, Tq. Omerga,  
District Osmanabad.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad.

03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Omerga,  
Tq.Omerga, Dist.Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr.L.C.Patil, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(19) WRIT PETITION NO.6946 OF 2018

Rajendra s/o Panditrao Deshmukh,  
ager: 38 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o 85, Jain Galli, Hingoli,  
District Hingoli.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,

through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

- 02 The District Collector,  
Hingoli,  
Tq. & Dist. Hingoli.
- 03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Hingoli, Dist. Hingoli.
- 04 The Tahsildar, Hingoli,  
Tq. & Dist. Hingoli.

Respondents

Mr.M.P.Kale, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(20) WRIT PETITION NO.6950 OF 2018

Chandrakant s/o Ramakant More,  
age: 22 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Mangalmurti Road, Karegaon Road,  
Parbhani, Tq. & District Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The District Collector,  
Hingoli,  
Tq. & Dist. Hingoli.
- 03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Tal. Basmat, Tq. Basmat,  
Dist. Hingoli.
- 04 The Tahsildar, Basmat,  
Tq. Basmat, Dist. Hingoli.

Respondents

Mr.M.P.Kale, advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(21) WRIT PETITION NO.7049 OF 2018

Gorakh s/o Radhakisan Mote,  
age: 43 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o More Galli, Gevrai, Tq.Gevrai,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Principal Secretary,  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
- 02 Divisional Commissioner,  
Aurangabad Division,  
Aurangabad.
- 03 The Collector, Beed,  
District Beed.
- 04 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Georai, Taluka Georai,  
District Beed.
- 05 The Tahsildar,  
Georai, Taluka Georai,  
District Beed.

Mr.G.K.Naik-Thigle, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents No.1 to 5.

WITH  
(22) WRIT PETITION NO.7057 OF 2018

Dnyaneshwar Mahadeo Jaybhay,  
age: 42 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Vidyanagar, Beed.  
Tq. & District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Beed, Tq. & District Beed.

04 Tahsildar, Beed,  
Tq. & District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.S.J.Salunke, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents No.1 to 4.

WITH  
(23) WRIT PETITION NO.7059 OF 2018

Nabaji s/o Rangnath Ambhore,  
age: 46 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Plot No.19, Deolali Parisar,  
Beed Bye Pass, Aurangabad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Aurangabad.

03 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station, Karmad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Aurangabad,  
Taluka & District Aurangabad.

Respondents



Mr.A.B.Kharosekar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents No.1 to 4.

WITH  
(24) WRIT PETITION NO.7076 OF 2018

Satish Chandrasen Kadam,  
age: 32 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Yelambghat, Tq. & District  
Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Beed, Tq. & District Beed.

04 Tahsildar, Beed,  
Tq. & District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.S.J.Salunke, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(25) WRIT PETITION NO.7077 OF 2018

Mahadev s/o Haridas Hulgunde,  
age: 35 years, Occ: Driver,  
R/o Nadi Hattarga, Tq. Nilanga,  
District Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office, Latur.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Collector Office, Omerga,  
District Osmanabad.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Omerga,  
Taluka Omerga,  
District Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr.K.B.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(26) WRIT PETITION NO.7133 OF 2018

Anantkumar s/o Munjaji Kurhe,  
age: 45 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Khuja, Tq. Purna, Dist.Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The District Collector, Parbhani,  
Tq. & District Parbhani.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Parbhani, Tq. & Dist.Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Parbhani,  
Tq. & District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.M.P.Kale, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH

(27) WRIT PETITION NO.7142 OF 2018

Akash s/o Piraji Adkine,  
age: 30 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Rav Rajur, Tq. Palam,  
District Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The District Collector, Parbhani,  
Tq. & District Parbhani.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Gangakhed, Tq. Gangakhed,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Palam,  
Tq. Plam, Dist.Parbhani.

Respondent

Mr.Mahesh P. Kale, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH

(28) WRIT PETITION NO.7143 OF 2018

Munjaji s/o Vitthal Lazade,  
age: 65 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Sawangi (Kh), Tq. & District  
Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The District Collector, Parbhani,  
Tq. & District Parbhani.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Parbhani, Taluka and  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Parbhani,  
Tq. & Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.Mahesh P. Kale, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(29) WRIT PETITION NO.7235 OF 2018

Vithal s/o Kadaji Jadhav,  
age: 38 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Pawarwadi, Tq. Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office, Beed.

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq.Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon,  
Tq.Majalgaon, Dist.Beed.

Respondents

Mr.H.P.Jadhav, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(30) WRIT PETITION NO.7725 OF 2018

Jalindar s/o Malharrao Pisal,

age: 52 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Teacher Colony, Georai,  
Tq. Georai, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The Collector,  
Beed, Tq. & District Beed.
- 03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Georai, District Beed,
- 04 The Tahsildar, Georai,  
Tq.Georai, District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Kawade, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(31) WRIT PETITION NO.7726 OF 2018

Shrikisan s/o Rambhau Wadne,  
age: 50 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Vadgaon (Gunda), Tq. & District  
Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 02 The District Collector, Beed,  
Tq. & District Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Beed, District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar, Beed,  
Tq. & District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.V.P.Savant, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(32) WRIT PETITION NO.7728 OF 2018

Dipak @ Aba s/o Pandurang Raut,  
age: 36 years, Occ: Agriculture and  
Business, R/o House No.1041,  
Kasba Peth, Barshi, Taluka Barshi,  
District Solapur.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office, Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Taluka Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon,  
Taluka Majalgaon, District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.A.B.Kharosekar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(33) WRIT PETITION NO.7732 OF 2018

Santosh s/o Haribhau Patat,  
age: 34 years, Occ: Agril.,  
R/o Gajanan Nagar, Majalgaon,  
Tq.Majalgaon, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office, Beed.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Collector Office, Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon,  
Taluka Majalgaon,  
District Beed.

05 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station (Rural),  
Majalgaon, Dist.Beed.

Respondents

Mr.S.V.Jadhawar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(34) WRIT PETITION NO.4195 OF 2018

Ajay s/o Manik Mundhe,  
age: 40 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/oManiknagar, Parli (Vaij),  
Tq. Parli (Vaij), District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue

and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.C.S.Kulkarni, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(35) WRIT PETITION NO.4194 OF 2018

Vyankati s/o Parmeshwar Mundhe,  
age: 40 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Zola, Tq. Gangakhed,  
District Parbhani.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.



WITH  
(36) WRIT PETITION NO.4188 OF 2018

Balasaheb s/o Rambhau Nagargoje,  
age: 33 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Mandekhali, Tq. Parli,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.
- 02 The Collector, Parbhani.
- 03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.
- 04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.C.S.Kulkarni, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(37) WRIT PETITION NO.4187 OF 2018

Govind s/o Nivrutti Shep,  
age: 38 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Shepwadi, Tq. Ambajogai,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

- 01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,

Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.C.S.Kulkarni, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(38) WRIT PETITION NO.4186 OF 2018

Babarao s/o Sheshrao Shep,  
age: 40 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Shepwadi, Tq. Ambajogai,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.C.S.Kulkarni, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(39) WRIT PETITION NO.4185 OF 2018

Ramchandra s/o Udhav Lahane,  
age: 40 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Makegaon, Tq. Renapur,  
District Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(40) WRIT PETITION NO.4184 OF 2018

Shriram s/o Tukaram Kendre,  
age: 48 years, Occ: Agril & Business,  
R/o Faudewadi, Tq. Renapur,  
District Latur.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,

Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector, Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri,  
District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar, Pathri,  
Tahsil Office, Pathri,  
Tq. Pathri, District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.C.S.Kulkarni, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(41) WRIT PETITION NO.4210 OF 2018

Jivan s/o Diliprao Jagtap,  
age: 28 years, Occ: Agril and  
Business, R/o Sawargaon,  
Tq.Majalgaon, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through the Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai.

02 The Collector, Beed.

03 The Deputy Collector, Beed.

04 The Tahsildar, Majalgaon,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon,  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist.Beed.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Dodge, advocate with Mr.P.N.Muley, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(42) WRIT PETITION NO.8174 OF 2018

Shivnath s/o Krushna Kedar,  
age: 32 years, Occ: Agriculture  
and Business, R/o More Vasti,  
At Post Rajpimpri,  
Tq.Georai, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Jalna.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
Ambad, Taluka Ambad,  
District Jalna.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Ambad,  
Taluka Ambad, District Jalna.

Respondents

Mr.A.B.Kharosekar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(43) WRIT PETITION NO.8170 OF 2018

Premsing s/o Magansing Chungade,  
ageL 55 years, Occ: Agricultural and  
Business, R/o Ambedkar Nagar,  
Rajput Mohalla, Ambad, Taluka Ambad,  
District Jalna.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,

Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Jalna

03 The Deputy Collector/  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
Ambad, Taluka Ambad,  
District Jalna.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Ambad,  
Taluka Ambad, District Jalna.

Respondents

Mr.A.B.Kharosekar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(44) WRIT PETITION NO.5726 OF 2018

Kachru s/o Bapurao Jadhav,  
age: 34 years, Occ: Agriculture,  
R/o Umradi, Taluka and District  
Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through the Secretary,  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Beed District Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Beed, District Beed.

04 The Tahsildar, Beed,  
District Beed.

Respondents

Mr.V.D.Gunale, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.M.Ganachari, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(45) WRIT PETITION NO.8061 OF 2018

Ajinkya s/o Baban Pawar,  
age: 24 years, Occ: Business,  
R/o Laxminagar, Bhingar,  
Tq. & District Ahmednagar.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
Department of Revenue  
and Forest, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai.

02 The Collector, Ahmednagar,  
District Ahmednagar.

03 The Tahsildar, Ahmednagar,  
District Ahmednagar.

Respondents

Mr.P.A.Pisal, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.S.S.Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

(46) WRIT PETITION NO.5145 OF 2018

Pravin s/o Kachru Jagtap,  
age: 30 years, Occ:Business,  
R/o Ban Shendra, Tq.Kannad,  
District Aurangabad.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through Collector,  
Aurangabad,  
District Aurangabad.

02 The Tahsildar and Taluka  
Executive Magistrate, Kannad,  
Tq. Kannad, Dist.Aurangabad.

03 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station, Kannad (Rural),  
Tq. Kannad, Dist.Aurangabad.

Respondents

Mr.V.D.Salunke, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(47) WRIT PETITION NO.5262 OF 2018

Devanand s/o Rajabhau Deshmukh,  
age: 42 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Sirsala, Tq. Parali (Vaij),  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(48) WRIT PETITION NO.5263 OF 2018

Salim Khan s/o Mehandi Khan,  
age: 23 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,



R/o Paithan Mohalla Mandawa,  
Tq. Ambajogai, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S,Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(49) WRIT PETITION NO.5264 OF 2018

Balasaheb s/o Rambhau Nagargoje,  
age: 32 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Mandekhal, Tq. Parali (Vaij),  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.P.K.Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(50) WRIT PETITION NO.5271 OF 2018

M/s Tushar Fabricators,  
through its Proprietor,  
Shri Harischandra s/o Eknath Parekar,  
age: 42 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Dautpur, Tq. Parali (Vaij),  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(51) WRIT PETITION NO.5272 OF 2018

Jivraj s/o Ankush Gitte,  
age: 48 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Belamba, Tq. Parali (Vaij),  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.Kalyan S. Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(52) WRIT PETITION NO.5273 OF 2018

Sambhaji s/o Gangaram Phad,  
age: 47 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Padmawati Galli, Parali Vaijinath,  
Tq. Parali Vaijinath, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,

through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(53) WRIT PETITION NO.5274 OF 2018

Suhas s/o Vasantryao Kshirsagar,  
age: 32 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Ambajogai, Shikshak Colony,  
Jijamata Chowk, Latur Road,  
Ambajogai, District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,

Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(54) WRIT PETITION NO.5275 OF 2018

Mahadeo s/o Shriram Gadade,  
age: 34 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Daudpur, Tq. Parali Vaijinath,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.S.G.Jadhavar, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(55) WRIT PETITION NO.5276 OF 2018

Abhijit s/o Ashokrao Jadhav,

age: 40 years, Occ: Agril. & Business,  
R/o Shindi, Tq. Kaij,  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra,  
through its Secretary,  
in the Department of  
Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani.

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Pathri, District Parbhani.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Sonpeth, Tq. Sonpeth,  
District Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr.K.S.Chavan, advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr.A.B.Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents.

WITH  
(56) WRIT PETITION NO. 5534 OF 2018

Keshav s/o Ranuji Gholap  
Age 48 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Jajid Jawala, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Advocate General  
Office of Advocate General Mumbai

03 The Collector, Beed

04 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalagaon,  
Dist. Beed.

05 Tahsildar, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

06 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. S.K. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(57) WRIT PETITION NO. 5541 OF 2018

Narayan S/o Dnyanobad Taur  
Age 47 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Kawadgaon-Thadi,  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector, Beed.

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

04 Tahsildar, Majalgaon,  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

05 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. S.K. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(58) WRIT PETITION NO. 5601 OF 2018

Anant s/o Vishwambhar Korde  
Age 33 years, Occ. Agril.  
R/o Harki Limbgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Advocate General  
Office of Advocate General Mumbai

03 The Collector, Beed.

04 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

05 Tahsildar, Majalgaon,  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

06 The Police Inspector,  
Police Station, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. S.K. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(59) WRIT PETITION NO. 5745 OF 2018

Kishor s/o Shamrao Bansode  
Age 32 years, Occ. Agril.  
r/o Bhamathan, Tq. Shrirampur  
District Ahmednagar

Petitioner



Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Maharashtra State, Mantralaya,  
Mumbai.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Ahmednagar

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Shrirampur Division, Shrirampur  
District Ahmednagar

04 The Tahsildar, Shrirampur  
District Ahmednagar

05 The Circle Inspector,  
Takali Bhan  
Tq. Shrirampur, Dist. Ahmednagar

06 The Talathi,  
Bhamathan, Tq. Shrirampur  
District Ahmednagar.

Respondents

Mr. B.G. Sagade, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(60) WRIT PETITION NO. 5848 OF 2018

Ashok S/o Malakajappa Dubari  
Aged 40 years, Occ.Agriculture  
R/o Shirwal, Tq. Afzalpur,  
Dist. Gulbarga (Karnataka State)

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through the Secretary to the  
Government of Maharashtra in

Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Fort,  
Mumbai 32

02 The Collector, Osmanabad

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar, Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

05 The Naib Tahsildar  
Omerga,  
Dist. Osmanabad

06 The Circle Officer,  
Omerga, Tq. Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

07 The Talathi  
Khasgi, Tq.Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

08 The Police Station Officer,  
Police Station Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

Respondents

Mr. S.S. Choudhary, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(61) WRIT PETITION NO. 5849 OF 2018

Prashant s/o Babruwan Kale  
Aged 35 years, Occ. Agriculture  
and Driver,  
R/o Lohara, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through the Secretary to the

Government of Maharashtra in  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Fort,  
Mumbai 32

02 The Collector, Osmanabad

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar, Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

05 The Naib Tahsildar  
Lohara,  
Dist. Osmanabad

06 The Talathi  
Dhanuri, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

07 The Talathi  
Dastapur, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

08 The Police Station Officer,  
Police Station Murum  
Dist. Osmanabad

Respondents

Mr. S.S. Choudhary, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(62) WRIT PETITION NO. 5936 OF 2018

Rambhau S/o Vithalrao Dahe  
Age 36 years, Occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Gajanan Nagar, Manwat,  
Tq. Manwat, Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary

in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector, Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Pathri, Tq. Pathri, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(63) WRIT PETITION NO. 5937 OF 2018

Mohan S/o Digambar Mahamale  
Age 36 years, Occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Hadulki, Tq. Ahmedpur  
Dist. Latur

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
in the Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector,  
Parbhani

03 The Deputy Collector, Gangakhed  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar,  
Palam, Tq. Palam, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. K.S. Chavan, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(64) WRIT PETITION NO. 6107 OF 2018

Nilesh Constructions  
Through Proprietor Shankarrao Uttamrao Patil  
Age 65 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Lalbag Colony, Dhule Chufuli  
At Nandurbar, Tq. & Dist. Nandurbar

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue & Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

02 The Collector, Nandurbar  
Dist. Nandurbar

03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Nandurbar, Tq. & Dist. Nandurbar

04 The Tahsildar, Nandurbar  
Tq. & Dist. Nandurbar

05 Nilkanth Bhaurao Marathe  
Age 35, Occ Job  
R/o Vidyanagar Hill, Dhule Rd.  
At Nandurbar, Tq & Dist. Nandurbar

Respondents

Mr. R.M. Jain, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents 1 to 4.  
Mr. A.R. Sayed, for respondent no. 5.

WITH  
(65) WRIT PETITION NO. 6150 OF 2018

Krushna s/o Babasaheb Solanke  
Age 32 years, Occ. Agri. & Business  
R/o Pthri, Tq. Pathri  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary

Revenue & Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector,  
Beed, Dist. Beed.

03 The Additional Collector,  
Beed, Dist. Beed

04 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

05 The Tahsildar,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

06 The Circle Inspector,  
Talkhed, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

07 The Police Inspector  
Police Station, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. S.K. Chavan, advocate for petitioners.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(66) WRIT PETITION NO. 6231 OF 2018

Arjun S/o Gunwantrao Nayak  
Age 35 Years, Occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Bhagwati, Tq. Sengaoon  
Dist. Hingoli

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector, Hingoli

Tq. & Dist. Hingoli

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Hingoli, Dist. Hingoli

04 The Tahsildar Hingoli  
Tq. & Dist. Hingoli

Respondents

Mr. M.P. Kale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(67) WRIT PETITION NO. 6508 OF 2018

Shaikh Maheboob s/o Shaikh Biban  
Age 32 Years, Occ. Agri. & Business  
R/o Dhangar Takali, Tq. Purna  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector, Parbhani  
Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Gangakhed, Tq. Gangakhed  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar Purna  
Tq. Purna, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. M.P. Kale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(68) WRIT PETITION NO. 6653 OF 2018

Kanifnath Baburao Nagare  
Age 48 years, Occ. Business

R/o Sangam Jalgaon, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner,  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
District Beed.

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Taluka Georai  
District Beed.

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Taluka Georai  
District Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(69) WRIT PETITION NO. 6827 OF 2018

Shanker s/o Babulal Pathan  
Age 28 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Lane No. 6 Hussain Colony  
Garkheda Parisar,  
Aurangabad  
Tq. & Dist Aurangabad.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue & Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32



02 The District Collector,  
Jalna, Dist. Jalna

03 The Sub Divisional Officer,  
Ambad, Tq. Ambad  
Dist. Jalna

04 The Tahsildar  
Ambad, Tq. Ambad  
Dist. Jalna

Respondents

Mr. A.N. Nagargoje, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(70) WRIT PETITION NO. 8205 OF 2018

Azar Ayyub Gavandi  
Age 38 years, Occ. Agril.  
R/o Lohara, Tq. Lohara  
Gavandi Plotting  
Dist. Osmanabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

02 The Collector  
Collector Office  
Osmanabad

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Sub-Divisional Office  
Omerga, Tq. Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsildar Office,  
Lohara, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

Respondents

Mr. R.P. Adgaonkar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for respondents.

WITH  
(71) WRIT PETITION NO. 8206 OF 2018

Zaheer Ahmed Ali Ma Aziz  
Age 45 years, Occ. Transporter  
R/o 11-2-30, Kanteshwar  
Nizamabad  
Tq. & Dist. Nizamabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector, Nanded  
Dist. Nanded

03 Sub Divisional Officer  
Nanded, Tq. & Dist Nanded

04 The Tahsildar, Biloli  
Tq. & Dist. Nanded

Respondents

Mr. Syed Azizoddin R., advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(72) WRIT PETITION NO. 8207 OF 2018

Swami Santhosh Siddappa  
Age 42 years, Occ. Business  
R/o 2-5-71, Near Head Post Office  
Bodhan, Tq. Bodhan, Dist. Nizamabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary

Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32

02 The Collector, Nanded  
Dist. Nanded.

03 Sub Divisional Officer,  
Nanded, Tq. & Dist. Nanded

04 The Tahasildar, Biloli,  
Tq. & Dist. Nanded.

Respondents

Mr. Syed Azizoddin R., advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(73) WRIT PETITION NO. 8208 OF 2018

P. Naga Bhushanam Mariah  
Age 42 years, Occ. Transporter  
R/o 6-12, Belal Farm Bodhan  
Nizamabad, Tq. & Dist. Nizamabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector, Nanded  
Dist. Nanded

03 Sub Divisional Officer  
Nanded  
Tq. & Dist Nanded

04 The Tahasildar, Biloli,  
Tq. & Dist. Nanded

Respondents

Mr. Syed Azizoddin R, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH

(74) WRIT PETITION NO. 8209 OF 2018

Kasarelli Hanmanthu Gangaram  
Age 38 years, Occ. Transporter  
R/o H No. 5-55/1, Banjagally,  
Sloora, Nizamabad  
Tq & Dist. Nizamabad (T.S.)

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector, Nanded  
Dist. Nanded.

03 Sub Divisional Officer  
Nanded, Tq. & Dist. Nanded

04 The Tahasildar, Biloli  
Tq. & Dist. Nanded

Respondents

Mr. Syed Azizoddin R., advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH

(75) WRIT PETITION NO. 7842 OF 2018

Dhanraj s/o Sandipan Bidgar  
Age 38 years, occ. Agril & Business  
R/o Dautpur, Tq. Parli Vaijnath  
District Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector  
Collector Office Beed

Tq. & Dist. Beed.

03 The District Mining Officer  
Collector Office, Beed  
Tq. & Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed

Respondents

Mr. A.V. Rakh, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(76) WRIT PETITION NO. 7540 OF 2018

Suresh s/o Haribhau More  
Age 47 years, Occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Roulasgaon,  
Tq. & Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Beed.

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Beed, Tq. & Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Georai  
Tq. Georai, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(77) WRIT PETITION NO. 7539 OF 2018

Subhash s/o Vitthalrao Ghane  
Age 40 years, occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Gondi, Tq. Ambad  
District Jalna

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Jalna

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Jalna, Tq. Jalna  
Dist. Jalna

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Ambad  
Tq. Ambad, Dist. Jalna

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(78) WRIT PETITION NO. 7538 OF 2018

Hari s/o Babasaheb Jadhav  
Age 34 years, occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o At Adola, Post Gangamasla  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,

Collector Office,  
Beed

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(79) WRIT PETITION NO. 7537 OF 2018

Vitthal s/o Rangnath Solunke  
Age 55 years, occ. Agril. & Business  
R/o Gondi, Tq. Ambad  
Dist. Jalna

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector  
Collector Office,  
Jalna

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Jalna, Tq. Jalna  
Dist. Jalna

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Ambad  
Tq. Ambad, Dist. Jalna

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(80) WRIT PETITION NO. 7464 OF 2018

Vishnu Kalidas Mundhe  
age 40 years, occ. Agri.  
R/o Govindpur, Tq. Kalamb  
District Osmanabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 The Collector  
Collector Office, Osmanabad

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer  
Collector Office, Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Osmanabad  
Tq. & Dist. Osmanabad

Respondents

Mr. H.P. Bondar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(81) WRIT PETITION NO. 7869 OF 2018

Hanif Shikalgar S/o Abdul Kadar  
age 28 years, occ. Business  
R/o Sathe nagar, Murum  
Tq. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department



Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Osmanabad

03 The Deputy Collector /  
Sub Divisional Officer,  
Omerga, Tq. Omerga  
Dist. Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Omerga  
Tq. Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad.

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(82) WRIT PETITION NO. 7425 OF 2018

Ukha s/o Nathu Patil  
age 53 years, occ. Agril  
R/o Upparpind, Shirpur  
Tq Shirpur, Dist Dhule

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 The District Collector,  
Dhule, Dist. Dhule.

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Shirpur, Tq Shirpur,  
Dist. Dhule.

04 The Tahsildar  
Shirpur, Tq. Shirpur  
Dist. Dhule.

Respondents

Mr. U.B. Bondar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(83) WRIT PETITION NO. 8017 OF 2018

Shubham Bhagwanrao Yadhav  
Age 24 years, occ Agril  
r/o Khadka, Tq. Sonpeth  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector,  
Parbhani, Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Pathari, Tq. Pathari  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar, Sonpeth  
Tq. Sonpeth, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(84) WRIT PETITION NO. 8012 OF 2018

Amol Prakash Tandale  
age 29 years, occ. Agril.  
R/o Parali(Vaijainath),  
Tq. Parali(Vaijainath)  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary

Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector  
Parbhani, Tq. & Dist Parbhani

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Pathri, Tq. Pathri,  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar, Sonpeth  
Tq. Sonpeth, Dist. Parbhani

Respondents

Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(85) WRIT PETITION NO. 7997 OF 2018

Ramesh Atmarao Shinde  
Age 39 years, occ. Agri  
R/o Vazur (Kh), Tq. Manwat  
Dist. Parbhani

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The District Collector,  
Parbhani, Tq. & Dist. Parbhani

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer  
Sailu, Tq. Sailu,  
Dist. Parbhani

04 The Tahsildar, Manwat  
Tq. Manwat, Dist. Parbhani.

Respondents

Mr. U.L. Momale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(86) WRIIT PETITION NO. 8015 OF 2018

Gangadhar s/o Kashinath Rajgude  
Age 45 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Kawadgaon (Zirpa)  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary,  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Beed,

03 The Sub Divisional Officer  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. P.K. Lakhotiya, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(87) WRIT PETITION NO. 8020 OF 2018

Kailas Bhuta Sonawane  
Age 45 years, Occ. Business  
R/o Vajjnath  
Tq. Yerandol.  
Dist. Jalgaon

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through  
The Secretary  
Revenue and Forest department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 The Collector,  
Jalgaon  
Collector Office,  
Jalgaon

03 The Sub Divisional Magistrate  
Yerandol Sub Division  
Yerandol, Dist. Jalgaon

04 The Tahsildar, Dharangaon  
Tahasil Office,  
Tq. Dharangaon, Dist. Jalgaon

Respondents

Mr. K.B. Borde Patil, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(88) WRIT PETITION NO. 7873 OF 2018

Prabhakar s/o Pundlik Patil  
Age 39 years, occ. Business  
R/o House No. 237, At Kudare  
Post Palaspa, Tq. Panvel  
Dist. Raigad  
At Present r/o Itke Corner  
Parali Vajjnath, Tq. Parali Vajjnath  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400 032.

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Beed.

03 The Deputy Collector /  
sub Divisional Officer  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. A.B. Kharosekar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(89) WRIT PETITION NO. 7868 OF 2018

Govind s/o Shivaji Pathade  
age 39 years, occ. Business  
r/o Murud, Tq. Latur  
Dist. Latur

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Secretary,  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector  
Collector Office,  
Beed.

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer,  
Majalgaon, Tq. Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalagaon, Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. H.P. Jadhav, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S. S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(90) WRIT PETITION NO. 7852 OF 2018

Vilas s/o Bhagwat Shendge  
Age 40 years, occ. Agri.  
R/o Barshi, Tq. Barshi  
Dist. Solapur

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through its Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 The Collector,  
Collector Office,  
Beed.

03 The Sub-Divisional Officer  
Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

04 The Tahsildar,  
Tahsil Office, Majalgaon  
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed.

05 The Police Inspector  
Police Station Majalgaon  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. S.V. Jadhavar, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(91) WRIT PETITION NO. 7877 OF 2018

Tatyarao s/o Zumbar Bhargande  
Age 54 years, Occ. Agri.  
R/o Kasti (Bk.), Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary to the  
Government of Maharashtra in  
Revenue & Forest Department,  
Mantralaya, Fort,  
Mumbai 32.

02 The Collector, Osmanabad  
Dist. Osmanabad

03 The Deputy Collector,  
Omerga, Dist. Osmanabad

04 The Tahsildar, Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

05 The Naib Tahsildar  
Lohara, Dist. Osmanabad

06 The Circle Officer,  
Lohara, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

07 The Talathi  
Dastapur, Tq. Lohara  
Dist. Osmanabad

Respondents

Mr. S.S. Choudhary, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(92) WRIT PETITION 7576 OF 2018

Jijabhau s/o Madanbhau Mote  
Occ. Agri. & business  
r/o Mote Galli, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai



02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(93) WRIT PETITION NO. 7590 OF 2018

Kishor s/o Kakasaheb Aher  
age 30 years, Occ. Agril & Business  
R/o Umapur, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(94) WRIT PETITION NO. 7589 OF 2018

Ram s/o Sarjerao Mote  
Age 30 years, Occ. Agril & Business  
R/o Mote Galli, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(95) WRIT PETITION NO. 7588 OF 2018

Shaikh Anis s/o Shaikh Lala

age 45 years, occ. Agri. & Business  
r/o Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(96) WRIT PETITION NO. 7587 OF 2018

Rajabhau s/o Gowardhan Pawar  
age 43 years, occ. Agril & Business  
r/o Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.  
Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

WITH  
(97) WRIT PETITION NO. 7586 OF 2018

Swapnil s/o Jaggannath Maske  
age 28 years, occ. Agri. & Business  
r/o Shivaji Nagar Georai,  
Tq. Georai, Dist. Beed.

Petitioner

Versus

01 The State of Maharashtra  
Through Principal Secretary  
Revenue and Forest Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai

02 Divisional Commissioner  
Aurangabad Division  
Aurangabad

03 The Collector, Beed  
Dist. Beed

04 Sub Divisional Officer  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed

05 The Tahsildar  
Georai, Tq. Georai  
Dist. Beed.

Respondents

Mr. G.K. Thigale, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Dande, A.G.P. for Respondents.

**CORAM : R.M.BORDE AND**

**A.M.DHAVAL, JJ.**

**RESERVED ON : 16th July, 2018**

**PRONOUNCED ON: 02nd August, 2018.**

**JUDGMENT (Per R.M.Borde, J.) :**

1           Heard. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith and heard finally by consent of learned counsel for respective parties.

2           In this group of petitions, petitioners are objecting to the orders passed by the Tahsildar or any other revenue officials directing imposition of penalty for unauthorised transportation or excess quantity of minor mineral or transportation of minor mineral without valid permit or transportation of minor mineral on the basis of invalid and fabricated permit. Apart from this, the orders, directing imposition of penalty in respect of vehicles, is also a matter of challenge.

3           Primary objection of the petitioners, in this petition, is in respect of applicability of Section 48(7) and (8) of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 (for short "Code of 1966).

4           Relying upon the judgment in the matter of **Vijay Dashrath Shirbhate Vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, 2010(1) All M.R. 842, it is contended that since the minor mineral i.e. sand is excavated with lawful authority, provisions of Section

48(7) are not attracted. Petitioners contend that it is not permissible for the Tahsildar or any other revenue official to impose penalty in respect of minor mineral which has been excavated out of an area/plot leased out validly by the State Government. According to the petitioners, they have not excavated unauthorisedly sand from an area forming part of the property vested in the State. Petitioners contend that since the source of minor mineral is an area leased out by the State under the policy framed in that regard, provisions of Code of 1966 would not be attracted and if, at all, the act alleged amounts to contravention of any provision, that would fall within the ambit of Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957. Section 48(1) of the Code of 1966 provides that the right to all minerals at whatever place found, whether on surface or underground, including all derelict or working mines and quarries, old dumps, pits, fields, *bandhas*, *nalas*, creeks, river beds and such other places, is and is hereby declared to be expressly reserved and shall vest in the State Government which shall have all powers necessary for the proper enjoyment of such rights. It is, thus, clear that the right to all minerals at whatever place found vests in the State Government. It is for the State Government under sub-section (3) of Section 48 to assign to any person its right over any minerals, mines or quarries, and in case for proper enjoyment of such right, it is necessary that all or any of the powers specified in sub-sections (1) and (2) should be exercised, the Collector may, by an order in writing, subject to such conditions as reservations as he may specify, delegate such powers to the person to whom the right has been assigned.

1966 are relevant for consideration, which are reproduced herein below :

**S.48. Government title to mines and minerals :**

(7) Any person who without lawful authority extracts, removes, collects, replaces, picks up or disposes of any mineral from working or derelict mines, quarries, old dumps, fields, *bandhas* (whether on the plea of repairing or constructions of bund of the fields or an any other plea), nallas, creeks, riverbeds, or such other places wherever situate, the right to which vests in, and has not been assigned by the State Government, shall, without prejudice to any other mode of action that may be taken against him, be liable , [on the order in writing of the Collector, or any revenue officer not below the rank of Tahsildar authorised by the collector in this behalf to pay penalty on of an amount [upto five times] the market value of the minerals so extracted, removed, collected, replaced, picked up or disposed of, as the case may be :

[\* \* \*]

[(8) (1) Without prejudice to the provisions of sub-section (7), the Collector or any revenue officer not below the rank of Tahsildar authorised by the Collector in this behalf, may seize and confiscate any mineral extracted, removed, collected, replaced, picked up or disposed of from any mine, quarry or other place referred to in sub-section (7), the right to which vests in, and has not been assigned by the State Government, and may also seize and confiscate any machinery and equipment used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and any means of

transport deployed to transport the same.

(2) Such machinery or equipment or means of transport, used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals or transportation thereof, which is seized under sub-section (1), shall be produced before the Collector or such other officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector authorised by the Collector in this behalf, within a period of forty-eight hours of such seizure, who may release such seized machinery, equipment or means of transport on payment by the owner thereof of such penalty as may be prescribed and also on furnishing personal bond of an amount not exceeding the market value of the seized machinery, equipment or means of transport shall not be used in future for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and transportation of the same.

6           Petitioners contend that it is only when any person, without lawful authority, extracts, removes, collects, replaces, picks up or disposes of any mineral, the State Government is empowered to take action and direct imposition of penalty. Sub-section (8) authorises the Collector or any revenue officer not below the rank of Tahsildar, authorised by the Collector, to seize and confiscate any mineral extracted, removed, collected, replaced, picked up or disposed of from any mine and any means of transport deployed to transport the same. Sub-section (8)(2) of Section 48 requires that such a machinery or equipment or means of transport which has been seized shall be produced before the Collector or such other officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector authorised by the Collector in this behalf, within a period of forty-eight hours of such seizure, who may release such seized



machinery, equipment or means of transport on payment by the owner thereof of such penalty as may be prescribed and also on furnishing personal bond of an amount not exceeding the market value of the seized machinery, equipment or means of transport with an undertaking that seized machinery, equipment or means of transport shall not be used in future for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and transportation of the same.

7           It is contended that sub-sections 8(1) and (2) of Section 48 of the Code of 1966 are referable to sub-section (7) of section 48. It is only when the minor minerals are collected and transported without any lawful authority, the provisions in respect of penalty for the minor minerals or the penalty for vehicle is leviable. Petitioners contend that in all the matters before the Court, the source of extraction of minor mineral is a plot or an area leased out by the State Government and as such, provisions of sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 48 are not at all attracted. It is neither permissible for the revenue officer to impose penalty in respect of minor minerals nor the transporters or owners of the vehicle can be directed to pay penalty in respect of vehicle or to execute a bond and tender an undertaking nor the vehicle can be seized and confiscated by taking recourse to the provisions of Code of 1966.

8           Our attention is drawn to the provisions of Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 (for short “Act of 1957”). The object of the Act is to provide for the development and regulation of mines and minerals under the control of the Union.

Section 3(a) of the Act of 1957 defines “Minerals”, which includes all minerals except mineral oils whereas “minor minerals” has been defined in sub-section (e) to mean building stones, gravel, ordinary clay, ordinary sand other than sand used for prescribed purposes and any other mineral which the Central Government may, by notification in the Official *Gazette* declare to be a minor mineral.

9           Section 14 of the Act of 1957 provides that the provisions of Sections 5 to 13 (inclusive) shall not apply to quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions in respect of minor minerals. Whereas Section 15 provides that the State Government may, by notification in the Official *Gazette*, make rules for regulating the grant of quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions in respect of minor minerals and for purposes connected therewith.

10           The State Government is also invested with the powers to make rules in respect of matters provided under sub-section (1A) (a) of Section 15 of the Act of 1957. Rule making power of the State includes providing for the rules in respect of the person by whom and the manner in which, applications for quarry leases, mining leases or other mineral concessions, may be made and the fees to be paid therefor.

11           The questions as regards the legislative competence of the State to frame rules relating to minor minerals was a matter of consideration before this Court in **Hari Constructions Vs. State**

**of Maharashtra and others**, 1995(1) M.L.R. 679. The Division Bench of this Court has observed that the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957 takes over the regulation of mines and development of minerals to the Union to the extent provided. It deals with minor minerals separately from other minerals. The subject of legislation in respect of minor minerals and covered by the Act of 1957, but to a specified extent and to that, extent the powers of State Legislature are wanting. The object of the MLR Code is revenue administration. The object of the said Act is to assess, charge, and collect revenue which includes penalty on account of illegal extraction of minerals vested in the State Government. Under section 48(1) where minerals vest in the State Government, they are entitled to proper enjoyment including the power of sale or disposal of the said minerals and if the said minerals are unauthorisedly removed, then the Collector, under section 48, is required to charge penalty which is in the nature of damages on account of loss suffered by the Government for unauthorised extraction of minerals. Under Section 2(19) of the Code of 1966, "land revenue" means all sums and payments, any cess or rate authorised by the State Government and includes premium, rent or any other payment provided under any act, contract or deed on account of any land. Revenue administration also includes rights of a Collector to impose penalty for unauthorised excavation of minerals which have vested in the Government. The Court has further held that in fact the land revenue is the State subject under List II of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution and there is no merit in the contention that the State Legislature has no competence to enact the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code and particularly Section 48(7) of the Code of

1966. The two acts operate in different and distinct spheres and that Section 48(7) of the Code of 1966 is not *ultra vires* the Constitution.

12 In the matter of **Vijay Dashrath Shirbhate** (cited *supra*) the Division Bench of this Court, in paragraph nos. 12 and 13 of the judgment, observed thus :

12 Maharashtra Land Revenue Code is dealing with lands and land revenue and under section 20, all lands which are not privately owned, vest in State Government. Under Section 48(1), the right to all minerals wherever found, vests in State Government. Section 48(7) deals with the cases where said right of State Government is violated. The said provision clearly shows that its application depends on the place where any mineral is found and it operates only when such place is not leased or assigned for mining of that mineral by State Government. The provision therefore, clearly show that it gets attracted only when the ownership rights of State Government over such mineral are violated. The violation of ownership rights is not regulated by the MM Act as it is integral part and parcel of right of revenue administration. It is to be noted recovery contemplated therein is without prejudice to any other liability incurred by wrongdoer because of his illegal act and hence, his liability under section 21 of MM Act is not affected in any manner.

13 The person who excavate with lawful authority is not subjected to said section 48(7). Also for excavation of mineral royalty from a place which has been assigned therefor by the State Government, the said provision is not applicable. It therefore, clearly shows that when such action is in derogation of the

ownership rights of State Government over such minerals, the State Government is competent to recover the penalty as stipulated in it. The penalty stipulated is three times the market value of the mineral extracted or Rs.1000/-, if thrice the value of extracted so mineral is less than Rs. One Thousand. It is also to be noticed that action thereunder is without prejudice to any other mode of legal action, that may be taken against him. Thus said provision itself contemplates that any other mode of action, if possible against such wrongdoer, is not affected thereby. It also does not contemplate any prosecution before levying such penalty.

13           It is further recorded in the judgment by the Division Bench that the provisions of Minor Minerals Act clearly show that the action thereunder is for violating the provisions of the said Act i.e. for breach of regulatory measures enacted by the Parliament. Those regulatory measures do not in any way derogate from ownership of either land or minerals of State Government, which are subject matter of or a consideration under Land Revenue Code, particularly Section 48 thereof.

14           It is, thus, clear that in view of Section 48(1) of the Code of 1966, right to all minerals at whatever place those are found vests in the State Government. Any act derogatory to ownership rights of the State over the minor minerals would be a matter falling within the provisions of Code of 1966.

15           Petitioners contend that since the source of minor minerals is an area leased out by the State to the respective contractors, their cases, even assuming that there is violation, do

not fall within the ambit of Code of 1966. The contention is devoid of substance for several reasons. The State Government has framed, in exercise of powers conferred under Section 15 of the Act of 1957, rules for regulating minor minerals those are called Maharashtra Minor Mineral Extraction (Development and Regulation) Rules, 2013 (for short "Rules of 2013"). Rule 66(11) provides that if any excess quantity over permitted limit is found to be removed the material shall be confiscated and permit holder shall be liable for punishment under the provisions of the Code of 1966 and Act of 1957.

16           Section 328 of the Code of 1966 empowers the State Government to make rules not inconsistent with the provisions of this Code for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Code. Sub-section 328 (2) (xix) authorises to make rules under Sub-section (8) of Section 48 prescribing the penalty to be paid by the owner for release of the machinery, equipment or means of transport used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and under Sub-section (9) of Section 48, the rules to regulate the extraction and removal of minor minerals. In exercise of powers conferred under sub-section (9) of Section 48, Sub-section (1) and clause (xix) of Sub-section (2) of Section 328 read with Sub-sections (2) of Section 329 of the Code of 1966, the Governor of Maharashtra has framed rules further to amend Maharashtra Land Revenue (Extraction and Removal of Minor Minerals) Rules, 1968. After Rule 8 of the Rules, Rule 9 is added providing for penalty under Sub-section (8) of Section 48 and personal bond. It is provided that the machinery and equipment or means of

transport, used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals or transportation thereof, which is seized under Sub-section (1), shall be produced before the Collector or such other officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector authorised by the Collector in this behalf, within a period of forty-eight hours of such seizure, who may release such seized machinery, equipment or means of transport on payment by the owner thereof of such penalty as may be prescribed and also on furnishing personal bond of an amount not exceeding the market value of the seized machinery, equipment or means of transport, stating therein that such seized machinery, equipment or means of transport shall not be used in future for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and transportation of the same. Under the provisions of Sub-section (8) of Section 48, the machinery and equipment may be released only after payment of penalty as mentioned in the table and after submission of personal bond as stipulated in Section 48(8) of the Code of 1966. the Table provided under the Rules specify the penalty per vehicle/equipment. Sub-rule (2) provides for execution of the personal bond recording the details as specified in the Rules. The petitioners have objected to the imposition of penalty in respect of the vehicle used for transportation of the minor minerals. It is contended that rule framed for imposition of penalty amounts to double jeopardy. It is contended that sub-section (8)(2) makes provision for execution of the bond of an amount not exceeding the market value of the seized machinery, equipment or means of transport as well as tendering of an undertaking to the effect that in future the machinery, equipment or means of transport shall

not be used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up and transportation of the same. It is contended, on the face of such penalty as provided under Sub-section (8)(2) of Section 48, the imposition of penalty in respect of vehicle would not be permissible.

17           On reading Sub-section (8)(1) of Section 48 of the Code, it is noticed that the Collector or any revenue officer, not below the rank of Tahsildar, authorised by the Collector in this behalf, may seize and confiscate any mineral extracted, removed, collected, replaced, picked up or disposed of from any mine, quarry or other place referred to in Sub-section (7) of Section 48, the right to which vests in, and has not been assigned by the State Government and may also seize and confiscate any machinery and equipment used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and any means of transport deployed to transport the same. Sub-section (2) obligates the authority to produce the vehicle before the Collector or such other officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector within forty-eight hours, who may release the machinery on payment by the owner, such penalty as may be prescribed and also on executing personal bond specified in Sub-section (2). The penalty in respect of vehicle has not been provided in Section 48(8)(2), but as a precondition for release of the vehicle, a personal bond and undertaking of the owner is required. Whereas, rule 9 provides for penalty in respect of machinery and equipment used for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal of minor minerals and the means of transportation. The imposition of penalty in respect of vehicle and



equipment is distinct than the condition imposed in respect of release of seized machinery or vehicle or equipment on production of the same before the Deputy Collector / Sub-Divisional Officer. The condition in respect of execution of a bond as a precondition for release of the vehicle cannot be equated with the imposition of penalty for violation, as provided under Rule 9. It cannot be contended that the rule, that has been framed, is beyond the rule making power of the State Government or that the same is contrary to any substantive provision of law. It is not questioned on the ground of competence of the State. The petitioners, though contend that the rule is unreasonable and as such is violative of Article 14 of the Constitution, it has not been substantiated as to how the same can be branded as unreasonable. The rule has been framed directing imposition of penalty for unauthorised extraction, removal, collection, replacement, picking up or disposal and transportation of minor minerals, to deter the violators of law from continuing with the illegal activities. It is noticed that there is rampant illegal activities in excavation, removal, collection, replacement, picking up and disposal and transportation of the sand and taking note thereof the State appears to have amended the rules prescribing for stringent penalty. Merely because the penalties are stringent cannot be a reason to brand it as unreasonable or illegal. The argument advanced by the Counsel appearing for the petitioners objecting to the imposition of penalty for vehicle or equipment or machinery which is within the framework of rules, is unsustainable. The challenge raised to the validity of the rules directing imposition of penalty for vehicle and the machinery used for unauthorised extraction of minor minerals, is devoid of substance and as such deserves to be turned down.

18           The petitioners contend that since the removal or excavation of sand is authorised i.e. from an area where the sand is excavated has been validly leased to the contractor, the transportation of the said minor mineral from the aforesaid source cannot be said to be violative of provisions of Section 48 of the Code of 1966. It is only when the excavation or transportation of minor minerals is conducted unauthorisedly i.e. within the area which vests in the State Government, same can be branded as unauthorised and the provisions of Code of 1966 can be invoked. The contention raised by the petitioners appears to be devoid of substance.

19           As has been recorded above, in the event of transportation of sand in excess of the quantity over permitted limit is liable for punishment under the provisions of Code of 1966 and Act of 1957 as well as Rule 66(11) of the Rules of 2013.

20           Apart from this, the State Government has framed policy for regulating the excavation and transportation of sand which has been declared under Government Resolution dated 03.01.2018. It is prescribed that the Government Resolution has been issued in view of the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave Petitions No. 19628-19629 of 2009, decided on 27.02.2012 as well as the decisions rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in PILs No. 1/2011, 116/2012, 202/2013, 79/2014 and 82/2014. Clause 11(1)(v) of the Government Resolution dated 03.01.2018 provides that extraction and transportation of sand shall be carried between 6'O clock in the morning till 6'O clock in

the evening. The extraction and transportation of sand beyond the aforesaid period shall be considered to be illegal and appropriate action would be taken. Clause 12 of the Government Resolution declares that the extraction of minor minerals in the riverbed shall be done manually and use of machinery like pokland, JCB is prohibited. Clause 13(c) provides that the transporter of minor mineral/sand shall possess a valid pass bearing bar code and if the transporter is found transporting sand without valid pass bearing bar code or if the period provided under the pass has expired, the excavation and transportation of sand would be deemed to be illegal and penal provisions of Section 48(7) and (8) Code of 1966 would be invoked and appropriate action would be taken.

21           The petitioners have placed reliance on the judgment in the matter of **Abdul Wasif Abdul Latif Vs. State of Maharashtra and another**, 2017(2) Mh.L.J. 356. In the reported matter, the truck of the petitioner carrying sand was seized by the respondents under Section 48(8) and he was directed to pay penalty for not covering the sand with tarpaulin or any other suitable mechanism. It was contended that provisions of Sections 47 and 48 can be invoked only if a person extracts, removes, collects, replaces, picks up or disposes of any mineral without lawful authority. It was contended that since the petitioner had not, without lawful authority, done anything for which action could have been initiated against petitioner under Sections 48(7) and (8) of the Code, the order of seizure as well as order imposing penalty is liable to be set aside. The contention was accepted by the Division Bench and it was found that the case of the petitioner

therein does not fall within the ambit of Sections 47 and 48 of the Code of 1966. The breach, that was alleged, was not referable to Section 47, or not referable to any of the rules or policy framed under the provisions of Code of 1966. The judgment cited is distinguishable and no parallel can be drawn with the act of the petitioner.

22 In the instant petitions, in certain matters though the transporters possess pass, the transportation of sand is in excess of the permit or in certain cases the period prescribed in the pass has either expired or that the pass itself is deficient in necessary particulars and as such cannot be deemed as valid. The conditions as provided under the Government policy permit transportation of sand between the period prescribed under the policy and with valid pass. If any of the conditions specified in the Government Resolution is breached, the excavation or transportation would be deemed to be illegal and calls for appropriate penalty under the Code of 1966. The petitioners cannot be permitted to contend that since the source of sand or minor minerals is referable to issuance of license or authorisation by the Government in favour of another contractor, the transportation, even if deficient or illegal on account of violation of certain conditions in the Government policy or the rules, shall be considered to be outside the provisions of Code of 1966, is not acceptable.

23 As has been recorded above, the provisions of Code of 1966 provide for revenue administration. The revenue administration, within its fold, brings collection of fees, cess, all

types of payments as well as premium, rent or penalties. Since the petitioners are found to have violated the provisions of Rules of 2013 or the policy directions contained in Government Resolution dated 03.01.2018, they are liable to be proceeded with and the provisions of Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 48 of the Code of 1966 can be invoked. Once it is noticed that action at the end of the petitioners is illegal, or the act is without lawful authority, they can be proceeded with under Sub-sections (7) and (8) of Section 48 of the Code of 1966. Since the violation attributable to the petitioners is branded illegal under the policy framed by the State, they cannot be permitted to contend that provisions of Sections 47 and 48 of the Code of 1966 are not attracted and no penalty can be imposed.

24 Another argument, that has been canvassed is of non-observance of principles of natural justice. It is contended that petitioners have not been extended an opportunity of hearing before imposing penalty. In certain matters, as in Writ Petition no. 4258/2018, notice issued by the Tahsildar directing the petitioner to show cause as to why penalty shall not be recovered from him on account of violation of conditions in respect of use of machinery for excavation of sand, is a matter of challenge. It is open for the petitioners to reply the notice and permit the Tahsildar to pass appropriate orders. If, at all, any order is passed by the Tahsildar directing imposition of penalty, the said order is liable to be challenged before superior revenue officer in an appeal by invoking appellate powers under the Code of 1966.

25 It would be open for the petitioners to question the

adverse orders passed by the revenue officials directing imposition of penalty. It would also be necessary for the revenue officers to produce the seized or confiscated machinery or vehicle used for illegal transportation or excavation of minor minerals before the Deputy Collector/Sub Divisional Officer within forty-eight hours. If the vehicle or machinery has not been produced, same shall be produced before the Collector or any other officer not below the rank of Deputy Collector authorised by the Collector, in that behalf, within forty-eight hours from the date of this order. On production of the vehicle, the concerned Deputy Collector or any officer shall observe the provisions of Section 48(8) (2) of the Code of 1966 and pass appropriate orders forthwith. The Revenue officers, before directing imposition of penalty other than in respect of minor minerals or for unauthorised use of vehicle for transportation of minor minerals or excavation of the same, are duty bound to extend an opportunity of hearing to the person who has committed violation; and to the transporter of the minor minerals or to the owner of the machinery. The revenue officials are bound to observe principles of natural justice before passing adverse orders against the transporter or owners of the machinery. The adverse orders passed by the revenue officials are liable to be challenged before the appellate forum provided under the Code of 1966 and it would be open for the petitioners or aggrieved parties to raise objection to the order, as permissible in law.

26           For the reasons recorded above, challenge raised to the provisions of Rule 9 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue (Extraction and Removal of Minor Mineral) Rule 1968, published in the notification dated 12.01.2018 stands rejected. The petitioners,

against whom an order in respect of imposition of penalty for the vehicle is levied, are liable to pay the amount as specified in the order subject to the availability of appellate remedies and the orders, those may be passed by the appellate forum.

27 As has been recorded above, if the vehicles in question have not been produced before the Sub-Divisional Officer or the Deputy Collector within contemplation of Section 48(8)(2) of the Code of 1966, such vehicles or machinery shall be produced within forty-eight hours from the date of this order and the Deputy Collector / Sub-Divisional Officer, on receipt of application by the owner of the vehicle or the machinery, after extending an opportunity of hearing to the concern, shall pass appropriate orders directing release of the vehicle, subject to imposition of penalty and fulfillment of other conditions provided under law, expeditiously and in any case, within a period of three days from the date of the application. Challenge raised to notices/order impugned in the petitions stands rejected.

28 Writ petitions are disposed of. Rule discharged accordingly. No costs.

Pending Civil Applications, if any, do not survive and stand disposed of.

**(A.M.DHAVAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**(R.M.BORDE)**  
**JUDGE**