



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

907 WRIT PETITION NO. 186 OF 2025

SUDESHNA DHANRAJ PATIL

VERSUS

THE COLLECTOR JALGAON AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. R. V. Gore Ravindra Vitthal

AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 : Mr. P. D. Patil

Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2, 3 and 9 : Mr. R. H. Mewara

Advocate for Respondent Nos. 4 to 7 : Mr. V. B. Patil

...

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.

Dated : February 13, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the parties.
2. Without going into the facts and the submissions into details, this Court finds substance in the submissions of the petitioner that the learned Collector while deciding the dispute, has not discussed anything about sufficiency of reasons for not holding the meetings.
3. In the present case, from the judgment passed by the learned Collector what is seen is that the, the learned Collector has not considered as to why he did not accept the explanation offered by the petitioner for not holding the meetings. This Court is remanding the matter back only to

that extent and not on any other point. The learned Collector to give hearing to the parties and specifically record finding about sufficiency of reasons.

4. Hence, the writ petition is partly allowed and disposed off.

5. The learned Collector to record reasoning within three weeks from today.

6. The learned AGP to communicate this order to the concerned today itself.

7. Parties to approach the learned Collector on 17.02.2025. No separate notice to the parties is required by the learned Collector.

(KISHORE C. SANT, J.)

PRW