



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

903 WRIT PETITION NO. 4218 OF 2025

BASHWARAJ MANOHAR RODGE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

...
Mr. R.K. Ashtekar Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. V.M. Kagne, A.G.P. for Resp. Nos. 1 to 4.
Mr. B.B. Yenge Advocate for Resp. No.5.
...

CORAM: SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 4th DECEMBER, 2025

ORDER :

1. Present Petition has been filed for following reliefs:-

"B) By issuing writ of mandamus or in the like nature the respondent authorities be directed to fix the boundaries of Hattibet, Tq-Udgir, Dist-Latur and prepare the map within a stipulated period.

C) By issuing writ of prohibition the respondent authorities may kindly be prohibited to carry out the various development works till the fixation of boundaries of Hattibeg, Tq-Udgir, Dist-Latur."

2. Learned Advocate Mr. Yenge appears for respondent No.5

and places on record the written instructions by respondent No.5. It is taken on record by marking as Exhibit "X". It is stated that the work of cutting trees was never undertaken at Hattibet, Taluka-Udgir, District-Latur.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was concerned about the cutting of the trees which he heard that was to be from Hattibet, which is tourist attraction.

4. Learned Advocate Mr. Yenge, upon instructions, also makes a statement that respondent No.5 has no plan to cut the trees and would not allow to cut the trees from Hattibet in future also.

5. In view of the said statement, the purpose of the petitioner appears to have been served. The Writ Petition, therefore, stands disposed of.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE