



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

**BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**WRIT PETITION NO.13832 OF 2025**

Dhananjay S/o Gangaram Deshmukh,  
Age-64 years, Occu:Agriculture,  
R/o-Bhosa, Taluka and District-Latur.

**...PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

- 1) The State of Maharashtra,  
Through its Secretary,  
Department of Revenue & Forest,  
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32,
- 2) Deputy Director of Land Record,  
Aurangabad, Taluka and  
District-Aurangabad,
- 3) The Superintendent of Land Record,  
Latur, Taluka and District-Latur,
- 4) Deputy Superintendent of Land Record,  
Latur, Taluka and District-Latur.

**...RESPONDENTS**

...  
Mr. Annasaheb S. Kadam Advocate for Petitioner.  
Mr. S.K. Tambe, Additional Government Pleader for  
Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

...

**CORAM: SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND  
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 20<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2025**

**ORDER [PER SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.] :**

1. Present Petition has been filed for direction to respondent No.3 to correct the record and map as per order dated 28<sup>th</sup> September 1980 passed by the Consolidation Officer, Osmanabad and take decision on application dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2023 pending before respondent No.3.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner. He submits that he is the owner and possessor of land to the extent of 1 H. 61 R. from Gat No.86, total admeasuring 12 H. 86 R., situated at village Bhosa, Taluka and District-Latur. He says that he purchased the said land from one Dattu Baburao Hajare on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004. It appears that the scheme under the Maharashtra Prevention of Fragmentation and Consolidation of Holdings Act was implemented in his village. It is stated that the petitioner had approached respondent No.4 to carry out the joint measurement of land Gat Nos. 86 and 87 in 2014, however, the land was not properly measured as the old record was not corrected. Thereafter the petitioner has given the history as to what was the original record and how it was not corrected. The petitioner, therefore, approached respondent No.3 by filing

application dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2023, which has not yet been decided, hence this Petition.

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader waives notice for all the respondents.

4. The first and foremost fact that is required to be noted, is that the petitioner is contending that the record ought to have been corrected on the basis of sanction dated 28<sup>th</sup> September 1980. Why his predecessor has not made any representation for correction of the record, has not been stated and when he had purchased the land in the year 2004, then whether he had got the land measured or not, is not clear. He also states that he has filed R.C.S. No.713 of 2021 before the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Latur for removal of encroachment and recovery of possession against adjacent land holders and it is pending. Under such circumstance, when substantial petition is pending, there is no question of directing respondent No.3 to correct the record and map as per order dated 28<sup>th</sup> September 1980. The only fact is that respondent No.3 cannot sit over the file i.e. application dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2023. He has to decide it on its own merits.

5. Therefore, we dispose of the Writ Petition by partly allowing it, by giving direction to respondent No.3 to decide the application filed by the petitioner dated 8<sup>th</sup> May 2023, within a period of THREE MONTHS from today.

**[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]**  
**JUDGE**

**[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]**  
**JUDGE**

asb/NOV25