



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 8432 OF 2025

Dr. Badrinarayan Narayandas Bagla

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Anil S. Bajaj, for Petitioner.
- Mr. S. P. Sonpawale, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
- Mr. S.P. Urgunde and Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8433 OF 2025

Amardeepsingh Amarjeetsingh Kohli

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Devdatta P. Palodkar, for Petitioner.
- Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
- Mr. S.P. Urgunde and Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 8434 OF 2025

Amardeepsingh Amarjeetsingh Kohli

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Devdatta P. Palodkar, for Petitioner.
- Ms. S. S. Joshi, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
- Mr. S.P. Urgunde and Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 8438 OF 2025

Mansingh Balasaheb Pawaar

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Devdatta P. Palodkar, for Petitioner.
- Ms. S. S. Joshi, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
- Mr. S.P. Urgunde and Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 8440 OF 2025

Nagpal Projects and Construction and Pvt Ltd
Through Its Director

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Devdatta P. Palodkar, for Petitioner.
- Mr. S. P. Sonpawale, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
- Mr. S.P. Urgunde and Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

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

DATE : 17th JULY 2025.

ORAL ORDER (PER – MANISH PITALE, J.) :

1. In these petitions, the statements made on behalf of respondent – Municipal Corporation have been recorded in orders dated 11th July 2025 and 15th July 2025, whereby adverse action against the petitioners has been averted. In fact, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent – Municipal Corporation in these

petitions had made a clear statement that coercive steps would not be taken against the petitioners till the next date of hearing.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent – Municipal Corporation had sought time to take appropriate instructions in the matter, after considering the documents filed along with these petitions and the specific contentions raised on behalf of the petitioners.

3. Today, when the petitions were called out for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioners sought to rely upon various judgments of this Court and the Supreme Court, to contend that the respondent – Municipal Corporation cannot be permitted to take any adverse action in respect of their properties / structures and that it must proceed only in accordance with law, even if the project of road widening is to be implemented.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent – Municipal Corporation in these petitions, on instructions, makes a categorical statement that in the event the properties / structures 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 law, including the position clarified by this Court and the Supreme Court in various judgments, shall be followed in letter and spirit.

5. This sufficiently takes care of the apprehensions expressed on behalf of the petitioners. Hence, upon recording the said statement made on behalf of the respondent – Municipal Corporation, these petitions are disposed of.

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

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)