



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

906 WRIT PETITION NO. 3661 OF 2025

Bhausahab Govindrao Bahire And Another

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Secretary And Others

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Kanade Angad Lala

AGP for Respondents: Mr. A. M. Phule

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAOKAR, JJ.**

Dated : November 11, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed for directions to respondent nos.1 to 6 to conduct the inquiry and to take legal action against respondent nos.7 to 10, as they have illegally constructed 'Panand Road' from middle of petitioners land without consent of the petitioners in view of the Government Resolution dated 21.6.2022 issued by the Planning Department (MNRGA), Mantralaya, Mumbai.

2. By order dated 20.3.2025, learned advocate for petitioners sought leave to delete name of respondent nos.7 to 9 and he was directed to produce a village map and revenue record of the petitioners alongwith the affidavit. In fact, petitioners have filed measurement map. Village map has not been produced. Now, when it is in respect of the Panand road, the Government Resolution, on which petitioners are relying dated 21.6.2022, it is in view of

sanction of “Matoshri Gramsamruddhi Shet/Panand Raste Yojana” vide Government Resolution dated 11.11.2021. That scheme was to be implemented by the Grampanchayat, Panchayat Samiti and Zilla Parishad, as the case may be after the proposal is given. If according to petitioners, the impugned road is constructed as Panand Road under the said scheme, then there ought to have been certain documents with respondent nos.1 to 6, as the case may be. The petitioners are not clear in their pleadings as to whether proposal was then submitted by the Grampanchayat or any other authority. No document showing that such road was not in existence prior to their representation dated 7.8.2023 is placed. The pleadings are also not clear to state when construction of the road was undertaken by respondent nos.3 to 6 and immediately why petitioners had not resisted. In spite of giving opportunity of placing the documents and affidavit that has been filed also does not further clarify the things. We are not inclined to exercise our powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Hence, Writ Petition stands **rejected**.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) (SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)

...

aaa-