

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO.25672 OF 2019
WITH
WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO.25674 OF 2019
WITH
WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO.25673 OF 2019
WITH
WRIT PETITION (ST.) NO.25675 OF 2019
WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.10149 OF 2019 (**Not on Board**)

Damodar Pandurang Patil (deceased) through his
LRs Vasant Damodar Patil and others ... Petitioners
Vs.
Dwarkabai Ganpat Patil and others ... Respondents

Mr. S. G. Karandikar i/b. Mr. Pradeep H. Patole for Petitioners.
Mr. Nitin Gangal for Respondent Nos.1 to 3.
Mr. S. H. Kankal, AGP for Respondents-State in W.P.(St.) Nos.25672 of
2019 and 25673 of 2019.
Mr. C. D. Mali, AGP for Respondents-State in W.P.(St.) Nos.25674 of
2019 and 25675 of 2019.

CORAM : UJJAL BHUYAN, J.
DATE : OCTOBER 17, 2019

P.C. :

**(W.P. No.10149 of 2019 -
Not on Board. Taken on Board.)**

Heard Mr. Karandikar, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Gangal, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3 in all the Petitions. Also heard Mr. Kankal, learned AGP for respondents-State in W.P.(St.) Nos.25672 of 2019 and 25673 of 2019 and Mr. Mali, learned AGP for respondents-State in W.P.(St.) Nos.25674 of 2019 and 25675 of 2019.

2. Considering the nature of controversy in the writ petitions and the order that is proposed to be passed, detailed reference to individual facts of each case may not be necessary.

3. Suffice it to say that petitioners have filed 5 revision applications

before respondent No.7 i.e. Additional Commissioner, Konkan Division, Mumbai against orders passed by the appellate authorities relating to mutation entries. Applications filed by the petitioners for grant of stay were refused by the revisional authority on 13.09.2019 against which the present writ petitions have been filed.

4. Since the revision applications are pending, Court is of the view that it would meet the ends of justice if a direction is issued to respondent No.7 to hear and decide the revision applications expeditiously.

5. At this stage, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 3 makes a fair statement at the Bar that during the pendency of the revision applications, the said respondents would not proceed further on the basis of the appellate orders.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners also makes a statement that petitioners would not create any third party rights during this period.

7. The statements made have been taken note of and accepted.

8. In view of the aforesaid and taking an overall view of the matter, revisional authority i.e. respondent No.7 is directed to hear and decide the revision applications filed by the petitioners one way or the other within a period of three months from the date of receipt of an authenticated copy of this order and during the interregnum, the statements made by the learned counsel for the parties would hold the field.

9. With the above direction, all the five writ petitions are disposed of.

(UJJAL BHUYAN, J.)