

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR
Writ Petition No.5309 of 2022

1. Naresh @ Narendra S/o Bhaurao Sarode,
Aged about 44 years,
Occupation- Agriculturist,
R/o Shani Chowk,
Katol, District Nagpur.
2. Vinod S/o Jijeba Gote,
Aged about 40 years,
Occupation – Agriculturist & Business,
R/o Near Ahale Hospital, Akola,
Naka Road, Washim,
District Washim.
3. Balaji S/o Sopan Kavar,
Aged about 41 years,
Occupation- Agriculturist and Business,
R/o At Post- Tamsi, Tq. & District Washim.
4. Kailash Narayan Kavar,
Aged about 43 years,
Occupation- Agriculturist and Business,
R/o Post Tamsi, Tq. & District Washim.
5. Laxman S/o Kashiram Gawande,
Aged about 41 years,
Occupation- Agriculturist and Business,
R/o Zakalwadi, Post- Tamsi,
Tq. & District Washim.
6. Jaykumar S/o Babarao Andhare,
Aged about 47 years,
Occupation- Agriculturist and Business,
R/o Godampura, Morshi,
District Amravati.

... Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra,
Through its Principal Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32.

2. Municipal Council, Katol,
Through its Chief Officer,
Katol, District- Nagpur.

... Respondents

Shri M.P. Khajanchi, Advocate for Petitioner.

Ms N.P. Mehta, Assistant Government Pleader for Respondent No.1.

Shri M.I. Dhatrak, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE & G.A. SANAP, JJ.

DATE : 19th SEPTEMBER, 2022

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.) :

1. Heard.
2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent.
3. The reply filed by respondent no.2-Municipal Council, Katol is categorical. In Paragraph 3, it is stated that the issue in question was taken up in the General Body meeting of the Municipal Council, Katol as subject No.11 on 19-3-2021 and in this meeting, after discussion, it was unanimously resolved that the subject land which is currently reserved for the purposes of Play-ground should not be acquired and this fact should be intimated to the land-owner. This reply is well-supported by copy of the Resolution bearing No.11/2021 which is at page 28.
4. It is, thus, clear that the subject land is not proposed to be acquired by the Municipal Council-respondent no.2, under Section 126 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act. Besides, there is

no dispute about receipt of notice by respondent no.2 which is a purchase notice by respondent no.2, u/s. 127 of the MRTP Act. These facts would entail this Court to allow this petition by issuing necessary directions.

5. The Writ Petition is allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) & (b). We direct that lapsing of the land shall be published accordingly by seeking necessary approvals within three months from the date of this order.

6. Rule in above terms. No costs.

(G.A. SANAP, J.)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.)

Lanjewar