

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 14780 OF 2019

Ravindra @ Rajendra Shivram Sonawane

PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Another

RESPONDENTS

Mr. Atmaram J. Patil, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Y. G. Gujrathi, AGP for respondent - State

Mr. V. J. Dixit, Senior Advocate a/w Mr. S. V. Dixit, for R-2

[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 2nd AUGUST, 2022

ORDER :

1. This petition is filed by the petitioner challenging the order dated 5th December, 2018 passed by the Hon'ble Minister of State (Revenue) in RTS 3218/Pra.Kra.56/J-6A, thereby setting aside the order passed by the Deputy Director of Land Records, Nashik and directing to enter names of the parties to the revision in the city survey record of CTS No. 934 of Mehrun, Taluka and District-Jalgaon and update the city survey record.

2. Mr. Dixit, learned senior advocate appearing for respondent No.2 raises issue of *locus standi* of the petitioner to challenge the said order.

3. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has *locus* to file present writ petition as the petitioner's rights are violated. However, on a pointed query, the learned advocate for the petitioner is not in a position to answer as to which right of the petitioner is violated. His only contention is that the petitioner has *locus* to file present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. To buttress his contention that the petitioner has *locus standi* to file the present writ petition, the learned advocate for the petitioner has relied on the following citations:

- I. *"Municipal Corporation of Bombay V/s Govind Laxman Sawant"* 1949 AIR (Bom) 229
- II. *"Raju Ramsingh Vasave V/s Mahesh Deoram Bhivapurkar"* 2009 (1) Mh.L.J. 1
- III. *"Dadaji Shankar Patil and Others V/s The Secretary and Another"* Writ Petition No. 7317 of 2019
- IV. *"Bangalore Medical Trust V/s B. S. Mudappa"* 1991 AIR SC P 1902
- V. *"Institute of Law V/s Neeraj Sharma"* 2014 AIR (SCW) 6357
- VI. *"Bar Council of Maharashtra V/s M. V. Dabholkar"* 1975 AIR SC 2092
- VII. *"Fertilizer Corporation Kamagar V/s Union of India"* 1981 AIR SC 344

4. The petitioner has averred in the writ petition that the

property CTS No. 934 is sold by the petitioner, his mother, brother and sisters. Therefore, as on today, the petitioner has no concern with the said property.

5. In that view of the matter, the petitioner has no *locus standi* to challenge the order passed in favour of respondent No.2. The citations relied upon by the petitioner are on different facts and are not applicable to the present case.

6. Present writ petition is, therefore, dismissed since the petitioner has no *locus standi* to challenge the order impugned in the present writ petition.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI]
JUDGE