

Niti

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.561 OF 2022

THE KONKANI SHANTI
PUBLICATIONS REP THR.
ITS AUTH. REP. ADAM
KHAN AND ANR.

... PETITIONERS

Versus

THE ADDITIONAL
COLLECTOR SOUTH GOA
DISTRICT AND 4 ORS.

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Jatin Ramaiya, Advocate for the Petitioners.

**Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. M. Salkar,
Government Advocate for the Respondent Nos.1,2 & 5.**

**CORAM: M. S. SONAK &
BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATE : 5th DECEMBER 2022

ORAL ORDER : (Per M.S. Sonak, J.)

1. Heard Mr. Ramaiya for the petitioners. The learned Advocate General appears along with Mr. Manish Salkar, learned Government Advocate for respondent nos.1,2 & 5.

2. For the order that we propose to make, based upon statement of the learned Advocate General, no notice is necessary to respondent

nos.3 & 4. The interest of respondent nos.3 & 4 will not be prejudiced.

3. The petitioners challenge the impugned order dated 22.07.2021 issued by the Additional Collector-I, South Goa District, Margao-Goa, to the extent such order revokes Conversion Sanad dated 02.06.2021 issued by the petitioners.

4. Mr. Ramaiya states that the impugned order was issued without minimum compliance with principles of natural justice and fair play. He states that the challenge is to the revocation and not the keeping in abeyance of the Sanad pending an inquiry. He further states that some directions should be issued to the respondents to complete the inquiry at the earliest so that the Sanad does not remain in abeyance for an unreasonable duration.

5. The learned Advocate General states that the impugned order will be construed as an order keeping in abeyance the Sanad issued to the petitioners pending the conclusion of the inquiry that is initiated. Further, he states that the inquiry will be completed as expeditiously as possible and, in any case, within two months from today. He states that opportunity of hearing will be granted to the petitioners and respondent nos.3 & 4. All these statements are accepted and the concerned respondents are directed to act accordingly.

6. Mr. Ramaiya, based on the instructions from the petitioner, has stated that until the inquiry is concluded, no construction nor development activity will be undertaken by the petitioners. This statement is also accepted. In any case, it is clarified that only till the inquiry concludes the Sanad shall be in abeyance.

7. All contentions of all parties on merits are left open.

8. The petition is disposed of in the above terms. There shall be no order for costs.

BHARAT P. DESHPANDE, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

NITI K
HALDANKAR

Digitally signed by
NITI K HALDANKAR
Date: 2022.12.05
18:01:47 +05'30'