

ISM

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 6817 OF 2019**

Shri. Shantaram Laxman Patil
and others

.....Petitioners

V/s.

Ananta Laxman Patil Decd through
LHR and another

.....Respondents

Mr. Vishal A. Patil for the Petitioner
None for respondents

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : JULY 3, 2019.

P.C.

Petition was heard in the first half and at the behest of the learned counsel for the petitioner. So as to make him convenient to take instructions on withdrawal, matter was posted in second half as was requested.

2 In the second half, the learned counsel instead of making the statement on the issue of withdrawal of the petition has come out

with a copy of Judgment in the matter of **Collector Land Acquisition, Anantnag & Another Vs. MST. Katiji & Ors [1987 AIR 1353]** and submits that the Court is required to appreciate the sufficient cause in the matter.

3 Perusal of the order impugned passed by the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal ('MRT' for short) demonstrates that the order of the Sub-Divisional Officer ('SDO' for short) passed on 25/11/2017 in Appellate jurisdiction was challenged before MRT in Revision under Section 76 of the Maharashtra Tenancy and Agricultural Lands Act, 1948.

4 The factual matrix as reflected in the petition demonstrates that vide order under Section 32G of the Act, on 27/03/1961, purchase price of the land in question was determined in favour of respondent-tenant. The petitioner questioned the same in 2016 before the SDO that too after period of lapse of 50 years.

5 The fact that for last 50 years, the petitioner was not diligent in pursuing his cause is taken into account by the SDO and MRT while dismissing the proceedings taken by him.

6 In that view of the matter, no case for interference in supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is made out. Petition fails, dismissed.

[NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.]