



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

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 14752 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 242 OF 2010
IN
SECOND APPEAL NO. 259 OF 2009**

M/s Reliance Automotive India
and others .. Applicants
Versus
The Collector Ahmednagar and others .. Respondents

Shri Gurucharnsingh Surjitsingh Punjabi, Party in person for applicants.

Shri S. V. Hange, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri S. S. Dande, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**WITH
REVIEW APPLICATION NO. 242 OF 2010
IN
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 12641 OF 2009
IN
SECOND APPEAL NO. 259 OF 2009**

M/s Reliance Automotive India
Through its Partners and others .. Applicants
Versus
The Collector Ahmednagar and others .. Respondents

Shri Gurucharnsingh Surjitsingh Punjabi, Party in person for applicants.

Shri S. V. Hange, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri S. S. Dande, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.
DATE : 10TH NOVEMBER, 2025.**

FINAL ORDER :

. Heard party in person at length, Mr. S. S. Dande and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for the respondents.

2. Party in person tendered on record compilation of documents on 03.11.2025. Mr. S. S. Dande, learned advocate has also filed on record synopsis and the relevant documents. The orders passed on 14.08.2009 and 23.02.2010 in Second Appeal No. 259 of 2009 are sought to be recalled by Review Application No. 242 of 2010. Civil Application No. 14752 of 2018 seeks direction to review the interest rates, to consider allotment and restoration of plot in question, besides the orders sought to be recalled.

3. Party in person has taken me through the written submissions as well as the documents annexed to the submissions. His main grievance was that by following due procedure of law he was allotted a plot at M. I. D. C. Ahmednagar. He had paid necessary charges. He spent huge amount in installing machinery and was running a manufacturing unit. It is further submitted that due to recession in 1991 and thereafter he suffered losses. The respondents had proposed action of eviction against him demanding illegal amounts with interest. It is further submitted that somehow he mustered funds by selling his assets and paid Rs. 10,41,511/- on 08.02.2010. It is submitted that grave injustice has been caused

to him by illegally dispossessing him from the plot. It is further submitted that his family members are the sufferers and action in question is violative of Article 300-A of the Constitution of India.

4. It is further contended that he is entitled to get back his plot. The action taken against him by the respondent authorities is illegal and perverse. He is being denied the opportunity to safeguard the industrial unit.

5. Per contra, learned counsel Mr. S. S. Dande appearing for the respondent No. 2 has pointed out that no case is made out for exercising review jurisdiction. After the orders which are sought to be reviewed, applicant had approached Supreme Court. His S.L.P. (Civil) No. 9110 of 2010 was dismissed on merits on 05.04.2010. The applicant failed to pay the dues since the year 1991. He was granted opportunity by order dated 14.08.2009 to deposit amount of Rs. 10,47,511/- within stipulated period. No compliance was made. The respondents were constrained to recover the possession on 11.01.2010 by following due procedure of law.

6. The party in person has not made any submissions so as to exercise powers of review. He is being repeatedly pointed out scope of review, but no endeavour has been made. On the contrary the submissions which are referred above are advanced which are already dealt with by the Trial Court as well as the

lower Appellate Court.

7. It reveals from record that applicant had filed R.C.S. No. 518 of 2001 against the respondents for declaration and injunction. It was dismissed on merits vide judgment dated 02.09.2004. Being aggrieved R.C.A. No. 187 of 2006 was preferred. It also concluded in dismissal on 10.12.2008. Against that present Second Appeal No. 259 of 2009 was preferred. Vide order dated 14.08.2009 applicant was directed to pay Rs. 10,47,511.68 on or before 14.10.2009. It was not complied with.

8. The possession of plot in question was taken from applicant under the provisions of the Bombay Government Premises Eviction Act. Civil Application No. 12641 of 2009 was preferred by him, which was rejected by reasoned order. Applicant did not deposit the amount within stipulated period.

9. No case is made out to cause any interference in the orders sought to be reviewed. The party in person even did not bother to refer to the text of those orders. It is not possible to go into the factual aspect of the matter which was already dealt with.

10. Over and above, after the orders in question, he had approached the Apex Court. His S.L.P. (Civil) No. 9110 of 2010 was dismissed on 05.04.2010. No liberty was granted by the Apex Court to file review, which is sought to be argued by the

applicants. The application for review and other applications are not tenable. I find no substance in the civil application as well as the review application and those are rejected.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME J.]

bsb/Nov. 25