

(1)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.41 OF 2017

Ramdas s/o Babarao More,
Age: 28 years, Occu: Agri.,
R/o. Nila, Tq. Loha, Dist. Nanded

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Chief Secretary,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
2. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Revenue and Forest Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai 32
3. The Divisional Commissioner,
Divisional Commissioner Office,
Aurangabad, Tq. Dist. Aurangabad

..RESPONDENTS

Mr P. S. Anerao, Advocate for petitioner;
Mr K. N. Lokhande, A.G.P. for respondents

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
A. G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

DATE : 26th August, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

The present public interest litigation is aimed at a grievance that as per the communication issued by respondent No.3 – Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad, dated 1st October, 2008 in view of the

(2)

provisions under Maharashtra Revenue Code modified to the extent of deletion of the name of the cultivator in 7/12 extract, causes some prejudice to the petitioner in particular and to the public in general. The very issue was raised in another Public Interest Litigation No.10 of 2015 and by way of detailed judgment delivered by the Division Bench of this Court on 3rd July, 2019/8th August, 2019, to which one of us (Prasanna B. Varale, J) was party, is considered and the Division Bench of this Court found no reason to entertain the public interest litigation.

2. In view of the decision of this Court, whereby the issue is already covered under the above referred judgment, we see no reason to entertain present public interest litigation. Accordingly, the public interest litigation is disposed of.

(A. G. GHAROTE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

sjk