

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.5947 OF 2019

DATTATRAYA NARAYAN MHAIS MALI
VERSUS
GRAMPANCHAYAT GONDEGAON THROUGH SARPANCH AND
ANOTHER

Mr.A.N.Walujkar and Mr.S.P.Pandav, Advocates for the petitioner.
Mr.N.T.Bhagat, AGP for respondent No.2.

(CORAM : Ravindra V.Ghuge, J.)

DATE : 25/07/2019

PER COURT :

1. I have heard the learned Advocates for the respective sides.
2. The petitioner desires to challenge the order of the District Supdt. of Land Records, Ahmednagar dated 29/06/2012. He has, therefore, approached the Director of Land Records at Pune for filing an appeal on 04/12/2018. His application for seeking condonation of delay dated 04/12/2018 is also filed. Delay is said to be of about 4 years and 2 months.
3. The learned AGP submits that there is a total confusion caused on account of a representation moved by the petitioner on

04/06/2012 before the District Superintendent of Land Records, Ahmednagar, who has made a report to the Deputy Director of Land Records, Nasik. He submits that the petitioner had already reached the Office of the Deputy Director of Land Records, Nasik after he had preferred his appeal No. 42/Ahmednagar/2012 against the order dated 10/07/2019 passed by the District Superintendent of Land Records, Dhule. On 27/04/2012, the Deputy Director has delivered his order invoking his powers u/s 255(3) of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code. This order will have to be challenged by the petitioner rather than moving around in different offices tendering his representations, which has caused the confusion.

4. The learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that he would file a revision before the Hon'ble Minister for challenging the order of the Deputy Director of Land Records dated 27/04/2012.

5. In view of the above, this petition is disposed off. If the petitioner prefers his revision, as noted above, within 4 (four) weeks from today, the time spent due to the representation of the petitioner dated 04/12/2018, erroneously lodged with the Director of Land Records, Pune, till the passing of this order, would be considered as a ground for condonation of delay.

6. The contentions of the litigating sides are kept open.

(Ravindra V.Ghuge, J.)