



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1 WRIT PETITION NO. 8334 OF 2025

RAJU SUDAM SALE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH
URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for the petitioner : Mr. Mukul Kulkarni h/f. Mr. S.D. Nimbalkar
AGP for the respondent – State : Mr. S.D. Ghayal
Advocate for respondent – Municipal Corporation : Mr. S.S. Tope
...

CORAM : **MANISH PITALE &
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.**

DATE : **14 AUGUST 2025**

PER COURT :

This petition was taken up on the Production board, due to the urgency projected on behalf of the petitioners.

2. The petitioners apprehend that the respondent – municipal corporation would be taking forcible possession of their properties in the backdrop of certain markings being placed on their properties. It is apprehended that such markings have been undertaken in the backdrop of the proposed widening of road.

3. The papers pertaining to this petition were served on Mr. Tope, learned counsel appearing for the contesting – Municipal Corporation.

4 When this petition is called out for hearing, the learned counsel for the Municipal Corporation has made a categorical statement that in the event the property / structure belonging to the petitioners are required while executing the project of road widening, the respondent – municipal corporation shall proceed strictly in accordance with law and that the mandate of the law, including the position clarified by this Court and the Supreme Court, in various judgments, shall be followed in letter and spirit.

5. We believe that this statement made by the learned counsel for the Municipal Corporation, sufficiently takes care of the apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioners.

6. Hence, the statement is recorded and this petition is disposed of in the light of the said statement.

7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE]
JUDGE

[MANISH PITALE]
JUDGE

arp/