

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT NAGPUR, NAGPUR.

...

WRIT PETITION NO. 6145/2022

* M/s M.K. India, Mumbai
A partnership firm through its
Partner (Registration No.BA-103104)
Manoj s/o Rajendra Khalatkar,
Aged about- adult,
Occupation: Business having its
office at B/103, Emgee Green, MTV
Road, Wadala (East), Mumbai

2. Manoj S/o Rajendra Khalatkar,
Aged about-adult, Occupation:
Business having its office at B/103,
Emgee Green, MTV Road,
Wadala (East), Mumbai.

..PETITIONER

v e r s u s

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

2) The Municipal Council, Katol
Through its Chief Officer,
Katol, Dist.Nagpur.

.. RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr M.P. Khajanchi, Advocate for petitioner
Ms. N.P. Mehta, Asst.Govt. Pleader for respondent no.1
Mr. M.I.Dhatrak, Advocate for respondent no.2
.....

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

DATED : 04.10.2022.

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

1. Heard Shri Khajanchi, learned counsel for the petitioner, Ms N.P Mehta, learned AGP who appears by waiving notice for respondent No.1 and Shri M.I. Dhatrak, learned counsel who appears by waiving notice for respondent No.2.

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.51 on 26.04.2021 and in this meeting, after discussion, it was unanimously resolved that the subject land which is currently reserved for the purposes of shopping Centre and 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.51/2022 which is at page 27.

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, 1966. 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.

JUDGE

JUDGE

manisha