



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 8680 OF 2025

Sandip Tarachand Bhagure & Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Thombre S.S., for Petitioner.
- Ms. S. S. Joshi, AGP for Respondent No.1.
- Mr. S. S. Tope, for Respondent Nos.2 and 3.

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

DATE : 29th JULY 2025.

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.
2. The petitioners have approached this Court on an apprehension that their properties / structures would be adversely affected in the light of certain announcements made on loudspeakers by officials of the respondent – Municipal Corporation. It is apprehended by the petitioners that their properties / structures would be adversely affected in the drive of widening of roads undertaken by the respondent – Municipal Corporation.
3. In order to address the apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioners, after referring to the development plan of the city of

Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar of the year 1991 and the recent development plan approved in May 2025, it is sought to be impressed upon this Court on behalf of the respondent – Municipal Corporation that 60 meter wide road was always part of the plan.

4. It is specifically stated, on instructions, by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent – Municipal Corporation that insofar as the petitioners in this petition are concerned, in the event the properties / structures belonging to the petitioners are required for 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. We are satisfied that the aforesaid statement sufficiently takes care of the apprehensions of the petitioners.

6. Having recorded the said statement on behalf of the respondent – Municipal Corporation, we are of the opinion that the petition can be disposed of.

7. In view of the above the petition stands disposed of upon

recording the said statement.

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

(Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)