

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

925 WRIT PETITION NO.6043 OF 2019

MOHAMMAD FARIDUDDIN SIDDIQUI MOHAMMAD SIRAJUDDIN SIDDIQUI
VERSUS
SYED MOINUDDIN SYED KARIMUDDIN THROUGH LRS SYED KHALED
SYED MOINUDDIN AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Khan M. A.

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.

DATE : 30th August, 2019

ORDER:

1. Heard Mr. Khan, the learned counsel for the petitioner. The petitioner is challenging the order passed by the Additional Divisional Commissioner in the revision filed by the petitioner challenging the mutation entry based on the sale deed in favour of respondent no.1.

2. There is no dispute that respondent Nos. 2 and 3 sold out the land in question to respondent no.1 vide sale deed dated 04.05.1996 and the mutation was taken on the basis of the said sale deed. It is the contention of the petitioner that there is a sale deed in his favour also dated 23.08.1996. So, there are two sale deeds for the same property. However, the sale deed of respondent no.1 is prior in time and the mutation entry in the name of the petitioner was set aside by the Collector on the basis of sale deed of respondent No.1 dated 04.05.1996.

3. It is settled law that mutation entries are meant for fiscal purposes and the mutation entry does not create any title in favour of any person. In the present matter, there is dispute about the title for which forum is not the Revenue Court. In the said backdrop, there is no merit in the present petition.

4. Writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

JPC