



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

945 WRIT PETITION NO. 10866 OF 2025

**PRALHAD CHAGAN BHAGURE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

.....

Advocate for the Petitioner : Ms. Pujari Shital Gorkshnath
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. A.R.Kale
Advocate for Resp.Nos.2 & 3/ Corporation : Mr. S.S. Tope

.....

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.
DATE : 24th September, 2025**

PC. :-

1. When the petition is taken up for consideration, it is not disputed that Writ Petition No.8680/2025 filed by one of the relatives of the Petitioner was disposed of. The said writ petition also concerns the property in the same area.
2. The learned counsel appearing for the Respondent/Municipal Corporation submits that this petition can also be disposed of in the same manner.
3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. The petitioner has approached this Court on an apprehension that his 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 petitioner that his properties / structures would be adversely affected in the drive of widening of roads undertaken by the respondent – Municipal Corporation.

5. In order to address the apprehension expressed on behalf of the petitioner, 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.

6. It is specifically stated, on instructions, by the learned counsel appearing for the respondent – Municipal Corporation that insofar as the petitioner in this petition is concerned, in the event the properties / structures belonging to the petitioner is 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.

7. We are satisfied that the aforesaid statement sufficiently takes care of the apprehension of the petitioner.

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

9. In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of upon recording the said statement.

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

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANISH PITALE, J.]