



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

35 WRIT PETITION NO. 8693 OF 2024

KHAN SAJEED MAJID
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH SECRETARY AND OTHERS

.....
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Mukhedkar Amit Arunkumar
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. S.R. Wakale
.....

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.
DATE : 19th August, 2024

PC. :-

1. The Petitioner claims to be a Journalist with Marathi daily Sakal, Mahur region at Nanded. His complaints are that Respondent No.5 is misusing his power and post, permitting conversion of several Class-II type occupancy lands of restricted use, into Class-I type occupancy lands, near Mahur taluka. There are several sale purchase transactions of several lands by executing registered sale-deeds in the office of the Sub-Registrar at Mahur involving crores of rupees, without paying the Nazrana amount to the Government. The lands are having restrictions on sale purchase transactions.
2. It is further alleged that such lands are first converted from Class-II lands into Class-I lands and then they are sold. One such illegal conversion is

with regard to land bearing Gut No.3/A ad-measuring 4 H 11 R, owned by Mr. Ramsingh Topa Jadhav. Another land is Gut No.3/B ad-measuring 4 H 11 R owned by Mr. Sitaram Topa Jadhav. Original owner of the Jahagirdar Inam land is Mr. Syed Moinuddin s/o Syed Rahimuddin. On 15.05.1966, Mr. Ramsingh Topa Jadhav, purchased the land from original Inamdar Syed Moinuddin being protected tenant. There is a breach of condition and the said land was unavailable for sale. The Tahsildar has granted permission for conversion of the occupancy type II into type I, on 25.04.2022.

3. The pleadings in the memo of the Petition run into 29 pages and these pleadings involve a host of allegations against the Tahsildar and several land holders. None of the land holders have been arrayed as Respondents. None of the purchasers have been arrayed as Respondents. The Petitioner contends that he being a Journalist and a Social Worker, he has no interest in the properties for the sale / purchase transactions. It is further contended that the Petitioner has filed certain complaints and the revenue authorities are looking into the complaints. According to the Petitioner, an inquiry committee has been constituted.

4. We find from the above pleadings that the Petitioner has put-forth a series of allegations against the Respondent No.5 - Tahsildar. Several sale instances are mentioned and it is contended that transaction of crores of rupees

have been made. It is also contended that several lakhs of rupees of Nazrana towards the State Government has been deprived. There is no material for substantiating such allegations.

5. Keeping in view that none of the land holders or persons who are alleged to have indulged in purchase / sale of lands or conversion of lands, have been arrayed as Respondents. The Petitioner does not have a personal gain and has not suffered a legal injury for which any relief could be sought in his own interest.

6. In view of the above, this Petition cannot be entertained in our Writ of Mandamus. **The Writ Petition is, therefore, dismissed.**

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]