Ajay

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 8509 OF 2024

Good Shepherd Convent (Bombay),
Through its Trustee .. Petitioner

Versus

Joint Charity Commissioner and Anr. .. Respondents

....

- Mr. Anupam Dholakia, Advocate i/by Mrs. Neela Dholakia for Petitioner.
- Ms. Snehal S. Jadhav, AGP for Respondent No.1 – State.
- Mr. C.G. Gavnekar a/w. Mr. Ashutosh Gavnekar and Mr. Rohit Parab, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : JULY 11, 2025.

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Dholakia, learned Advocate for Petitioner; Ms. Jadhav, learned AGP for Respondent No.1 – State and Mr. Gavnekar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2.

2. This Writ Petition is filed by Petitioner – Trust to challenge the order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the Joint Charity Commissioner – in Application No.14 of 2022.

3. Briefly stated, the relevant facts for determination of the present Writ Petition are as under:-

3.1. Petitioner – Trust is the Society registered under the provisions of Societies Registration Act, 1860 (for short "**the said Act**") and also registered as a Public Trust under the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950. By virtue of a registered Sale Deed dated 09.05.2009, Petitioner purchased and acquired immovable property viz land being Survey Nos.5/1A/1 and 5/1A/2 ad-measuring 3080 square meters situated at Village Gunge, Taluka Karjat, District Raigad (for short "**the said land**") keeping its charitable objects in mind. Petitioner – Trust predominately operates and runs a School in Mumbai. The said land was lying idle since Petitioner – Trust did not have enough resources to utilise the land towards fulfilment of its objects.

3.2. In the meanwhile, some time in the year 2015, Karjat Municipal Council acquired 885 square meters out of the said land for a designated public purpose and thus Petitioners are now left with 2194 square meters of the said land. Trustees of the Petitioner – Trust unanimously decided to sell the said land to raise revenue and utilise the same for fulfilment of the objects of the Trust and in pursuance of the said decision, Trustees issued public notice inviting offers for purchase of the said land. Petitioner – Trust received three offers from prospective purchasers. Respondent No.2 – Gajanan B. Deshmukh was the highest bidder who offered a bid price of Rs.1,65,00,000/-. The Board of Trustees of the Petitioners – Trust passed an unanimous resolution to accept the highest offer.

3.3. However before doing so, Petitioner – Trust obtained a Valuation Report to determine the market value of the said land from S.V. Joglekar and Associates, a Government approved Valuer who personally visited the said land on 15.03.2021 and submitted a detailed Valuation Report dated 23.03.2021 which was considered by the Petitioner – Trust before passing the unanimous resolution on 26.07.2021. In the said Valuation Report, Valuer opined that market value of the said land was approximately Rs.1,60,00,000/- to be computed at the rate of Rs.7,500/- per square meter. Valuer further opined that considering the present condition and status of the said land the fair market value of the said land could be determined at Rs.1,44,00,000/- at the rate of Rs.7,300/- per square meter. In this background, Petitioner – Trust through its Trustee filed Application under Section 36(1)(a) of the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950 before Respondent No.1 – Joint Charity Commissioner-I seeking sanction to sell the said land. Application was nomenclatured as Application No.14 of 2022. Appended to the said Application was the Valuation Report alongwith comparable sales chart prepared by the Valuer relying upon three comparable sale transactions within the same locality in close proximity of time and distance.

3.4. At the time of hearing of the Application before the Joint Charity Commissioner-I, Affidavit dated 18.09.2023 of Mr. Sharad V. Joglekar on behalf of S.V. Joglekar and Associates, the Government approved Valuer was also submitted wherein the Valuer further explained and confirmed his Valuation Report. Application was heard by Respondent No.1 – Competent Authority. Sanction was accorded by the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 permitting Petitioner – Trust to sell the said land subject to the condition that the said land be sold for a consideration of Rs.2,35,00,000/- and not the highest bid offered by Respondent No.2. The order dated 10.11.2023 is thus the subject matter of challenge before this Court.

4. Mr. Dholakia, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Petitioner – Trust would submit that the only reason accorded by the Competent Authority to consider the market value of the said land at Rs.2,35,00,000/- is on the basis of rate of land shown in the ready reckoner for open land for the year 2022 – 2023. He would submit that the findings returned by Respondent No.1 – Competent Authority that the market value of the said land could not be less than Rs.2,35,00,000/- is not based on any Valuation Report or exercise undertaken by the Respondent No.1 and case of the Petitioner – Trust has been completely ignored and disregarded by the Competent Authority.

4.1. He would submit that Competent Authority erred in presuming and arriving at a surmise that valuation of open land at the rate of ready reckoner is always less than the actual market value and therefore the said land cannot be sold below Rs.2,35,00,000/-. He would submit that though Application of the Petitioner – Trust was supported by the Valuation Report of a Government approved Valuer which was based on the comparable sale instances method by comparing for arriving at the market value of the said land on the basis of three sale instances of identically situated lands within close proximity, distance and time with respect to the said land, still the same is not considered at all.

4.2. He would submit that even after the impugned order was passed on 10.11.2023, Petitioner – Trust had to take a considered decision and it was only on 16.04.2024, Petitioner – Trust decided to challenge the order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the Joint Charity Commissioner-I. He would submit that considering the orders passed by this Court on 09.06.2025 followed by order dated 01.07.2025, Respondent Nos.1 and 2 have both filed their respective Affidavits. He would persuade me to consider the Affidavits filed by Respondent No.2 wherein he has on the insistence of the Court increased his bid amount which he had offered in the year 2021 by 15% as he is ready and willing to purchase the said land from the Petitioner – Trust subject to compliance of statutory provisions.

4.3. Equally, he would persuade me to consider the Affidavit-in-Reply filed by Respondent No.1 – Joint Charity Commissioner pursuant to directions passed by this Court on the previous date and submit that Respondent No.1 has once again opposed sale of the said land below Rs.2,35,00,000/- without substantiating the same. He would submit that at the time of hearing, the Application seeking sanction before Respondent No.1 and even before this Court the stand adopted by Respondent No.1 is not substantiated by any material or documentary evidence whereas Petitioner – Trust has placed on record Valuation Report prepared by a Government approved empanelled Valuer alongwith his Affidavit which in turn is based upon comparable sales method for arriving at the market value of the said land.

4.4. That apart, he would persuade me to consider the exigency and ignominy faced by Petitioner – Trust with respect to the delay that has occurred and consider the offer which is now increased by Respondent No.2 as a fair and correct market value viz-a-viz the Valuation Report submitted by the Petitioner – Trust of its valuation or in the alternate decide the market value after hearing Respondent No.2 and pass appropriate order and modify the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 accordingly and allow the Application filed by Petitioner – Trust in the interest of justice.

5. After hearing the Petitioner and Respondent No.1 on 09.06.2025, the aforesaid facts were observed and Petitioner was therefore directed to implead Gajanan B. Deshmukh the highest bidder as Respondent No.2 to the present Petition. Pursuant thereto Respondent No.2 filed his Affidavit-in-Reply dated 26.06.2025 wherein he stated that he is ready and willing to increase his bid offer by another 15% to take the total sale price offered upto Rs.1,89,75,000/-.

6. On 01.07.2025, I heard the learned Advocates representing all parties in the present Petition and the following order was passed:-

> "***1.*** *Heard Mr. Dholakia, learned Advocate for Petitioner; Mr. Gavnekar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.2 and Ms. Jadhav, learned AGP for Respondent No.1 – State.*
>
> ***2.*** *On 9th June, 2025, after hearing learned Advocates for respective parties, following order was passed:-*
>
> > *"1. Heard Mr. Dholakia, learned Advocate for Petitioner and Mr. Bhadang, learned AGP for Respondent No.1 – State.*
> >
> > *2. The order impugned in the present Writ Petition is appended at Exhibit "G" – page No.45 of the Petition passed under Section 36(1) (a) of the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950. Applicant is the Trust. It has moved this Court for seeking variation in the order that has been passed. According to Petitioner, market value of the subject property cannot be more than Rs.1.65 crores which has been offered by the highest bidder. However while determining the market value the Statutory Officer has considered various aspects, inter alia, the chart produced by the Government Approved Valuer S.V. Jogalekar & Associates dated 08.06.2022 and after comparing sale instances of 3 different properties which were transacted between November 2020 and November 2021, he has arrived at a conclusion that the market value of the property can be safely enhanced to Rs. 2.35 Crores. The reasons for the same are given by the Statutory Officer in paragraph Nos.11 to 17 of the impugned order.*
> >
> > *3. Petitioner – Trust is trying to challenge the said order on behalf of the highest bidder. According to the learned Advocate for Petitioner the highest bidder had given a bid of Rs. 1.65 crores for the subject property and if the impugned order is sustained the highest bidder would not be in a*

> *position to accept the same. While filing the Petition, Petitioner has not impleaded the highest bidder who according to them has given the highest bid of Rs.1.65 crores. The name of the highest bidder is one Shri. Gajanan B. Deshmukh as stated in the Petition.*
>
> *4. Petitioner is directed to implead Gajanan B. Deshmukh as Respondent No.2 in the present Petition and serve him the copy of the present Writ Petition. Amendment is permitted to be carried out forthwith. Re-verification stands dispensed with. This Court would like to know from the highest bidder as to whether he would be interested in enhancing his offer and accept the valuation stated in the order dated 10.11.2023, inter alia, with respect to valuation of the subject property.*
>
> *5. In view of the above, issue notice to Respondent No.2. Humdast permitted.*
>
> *6. In addition to Court notice, Petitioner is permitted to serve a copy of the Writ Petition and this order on Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and inform him about the next date of hearing by any permissible private mode of service and file appropriate Affidavit of service with tangible proof thereof on or before the next date. Copy of the amended Petition be served on the other side.*
>
> *7. After receiving notice, Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 are directed to take cognizance of this order and file his Affidavit-in-Reply on or before the next date, if so desired.*
>
> *8. It is clarified that further order will be passed after hearing the Respondents on the next adjourned date.*
>
> *9. At the request of Mr. Dholakia, stand over to* ***23rd June 2025****.”*

3. *In compliance of said order the highest bidder one Shri. Gajanan B. Deshmukh has been impleaded as party respondent in the present Petition. He has filed Affidavit-in-Reply which is appended at page No.60 of the Application. Copy of the same is duly served upon the learned Advocate for Petitioner as also learned AGP. The learned AGP represents Respondent No.1 – the Joint Charity Commissioner in the present case who has passed the impugned order which is the subject matter of the petition.*

4. *Intervention, indulgence and consideration by the Court is prima facie depicted in the order dated 9th June, 2025 delineated hereinabove in paragraph Nos.2, 3 and 4 thereof. In compliance, Respondent No.2 namely Shri. Gajanan B. Deshmukh the highest bidder has filed Affidavit-in-Reply dated*

26.06.2025 wherein in regard to the directions contained in paragraph No.4 of the previous order he has stated that considering his offer of Rs.1.65 crores having been made in the year 2021 and the time lapsed thereafter, he is ready and willing to increase the same by another 15% and has committed and agreed to pay an amount of Rs.1,89,75,000/- (Rupees One Crore Eighty Nine Lakhs Seventy Five Thousand Only).

4.1. *Respondent No.2 - Mr. Gajanan B. Deshmukh is present in Court today at the time of passing of this order and he confirms the above offer of Rs.1,89,75,000/- (Rupees One Crore Eighty Nine Lakhs Seventy Five Thousand Only). He is duly represented by Mr. Gavnekar.*

4.2. *Apart from above, Respondent No.2 has in paragraph No.8 of his Affidavit has stated that subject land in question was situated near a slum locality, the plot offered for sale is of irregular shape, part of the land is marshy land filled with water and in view of these negative factors and considering future potential and scope of development, he as the highest bidder would have to incur expenses and hence he had offered highest bid of Rs.1.65 crores which he seeks to enhance to Rs.1,89,75,000/- today.*

5. *As noted in the previous order the Joint Charity Commissioner has delineated and arrived at the market rate of the subject land / plot to be in the range of Rs.2.35 crores. It is prima facie seen that fixation of this market value of the Commissioner is merely based on the Ready Reckoner value i.e. the basic valuation register prepared by the Government in respect of ascertaining value of open land / lands whether constructed or open in a large area without adhering to the nuances and factors affecting the individual lands. Admittedly there is no valuation report considered by the Competent Authority. The land is in Karjat area, outside Mumbai and needs to be protected, preserved and kept safe from encroachment. It belongs to the Trust which runs a school in Mumbai. The Supreme Court in a catena of decisions has held that valuation based purely on the Ready Reckoner value and basic valuation register cannot be held to be true and correct market value of the lands in valuation proceedings while valuing the land and the true and correct market value of the land is required to be ascertained and determined on the basis of its features, positive and negative factors affecting the land, comparable sales method or any other method.*

6. *In that view of the matter and considering the offers which are delineated hereinabove, I am of the opinion that undoubtedly the market value arrived at by the Joint Charity Commissioner will therefore have to be considered by the Court since even after four years, the highest bidder is ready and willing to honour his bid and also shown his bonafides to increase his bid by 15%.*

> *7. At this juncture Mr. Dholakia, learned Advocate for Petitioner Trust would persuade the Court to consider persuading the Respondent No.2 to increase his bid upto Rs.2 crores considering various features of subject land and in view of the oral discussions which took place with the Trustees.*
>
> *8. In that view of the matter, I am inclined to direct the Petitioner as also the Joint Charity Commissioner duly represented by the learned AGP to file their Affidavit-in-Rejoinder to the Affidavit-in-Reply dated 26.06.2025 and deal with the aforesaid aspects and more specifically the contents of paragraph Nos. 8 and 9 of the Affidavit of Respondent No.2 to enable this Court to determine the present Writ Petition in accordance with law. Affidavit-in-Rejoinder is directed to be filed within a period one week from today with an advance copy of the same served on the other side.*
>
> *9. The Joint Charity Commissioner shall apply his mind to the Affidavit-in-Reply filed by Respondent No.2 as also the issue of valuation of the subject land and give appropriate instructions to Ms. Jadhav, learned AGP to enable her to file Affidavit-in-Rejoinder on the next adjoined date.*
>
> *10. Stand over to **8th July, 2025 (F.O.B.)**."*

7. Mr. Gavnekar, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of Respondent No.2 at the outset, without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties would on instructions received from Respondent No.2 submit that the proposed increase of 15% offered by Respondent No.2 may be considered by the Court in the light of the various features and factors affecting the said land as also the timeline and delay which has occurred and has in his usual fairness persuaded the Court to determine the fair market value of the said land after taking into account the Valuation Report of Mr. S.V. Joglekar and Associates, Government approved Valuer appended at page No.41 of the Petition which gives a complete comprehensive and comparative analysis of comparison of the said land with three comparable sale instances and in that view of the matter pass appropriate orders.

7.1. He would in all fairness would submit that at the highest Respondent No.2 has given instructions to him to increase the bid amount by 20% over and above Rs.1,65,00,000/- which was the highest bid amount due to the time lag and not anything more which in his respectful submission would be a fair market value of the said land in the facts of the case.

8. Ms. Jadhav, learned AGP appearing on behalf of Respondent No.1 – State would draw my attention to the Affidavit-in-Reply filed by Respondent No.1 – Joint Charity Commissioner dated 08.07.2025 to contend that there are certain features which are to be accounted for to appreciate the value of the said land since the said land is situated within the limits of Karjat Municipal Council and therefore would command a substantial market value. Though it is stated in the Affidavit that the Valuer S.V. Joglekar and Associates in his Valuation Report has not considered sale instances of properties in the vicinity in the recent past, save and except that statement appearing in paragraph No.2, there is no substantiation of the same. However, the said statement on the face of record is incorrect as the Report of the Valuer to the contrary.

8.1. Second reason given by Respondent No.1 for rejection of the Report of S.V. Joglekar and Associates is that comparable sales method employed by the Valuer has not compared the said land on the ground of size since the sale instance land is either bigger in size or of smaller size and therefore according to him the same ought to be rejected. Ms. Jadhav therefore persuades me to dismiss the Writ Petition and uphold the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 and the valuation of the said land @ Rs.2,35,00,000/- determined by Respondent No.1.

9. I have heard the learned Advocates appearing for the respective parties at the bar and perused the entire record of the case before me. Submissions made by them have received due consideration of the Court.

10. To begin with one needs to understand whether the exercise of valuation attempted and done by the Petitioner – Trust and placed on record before Respondent No.1 – Joint Charity Commissioner has been correctly done or otherwise as this issue in my opinion goes to the root of the matter. The Valuation Report is appended at page No.41 of the Petition. It is *prima facie* seen that the Valuer has adopted the comparable sales method wherein he has compared the said land with three sale instances which are within close proximity of time and distance of the said land. It is seen that while comparing the same, the Valuer has carried out exercise of comparison on the basis of proximity of time, zoning, proximity of distance from Railway Station, size of the land, access and approach etc. It is seen that after giving positive allowances and negative deductions, the Valuer has arrived at the market value of the said land as opined by him being an expert in the field valuation after considering the certified copies of Sale Agreements and Index-II of the comparable sale instances and rate of ready reckoner of the said land belonging to the Trust.

11. It is seen that in the Affidavit in support submitted by the Valuer alongwith the Valuation Report before the Respondent No.1, he has stated that the said land is affected by some portion which is marshy and hence deduction will have to be given for the same as compared to normal land. That apart, he has stated that some portion of the said land is a low lying area due to which purchaser of the said land will have to incur expenditure while developing the said land for levelling. That apart, he has stated that approach to the said land is through the D.P. road and it is situated at a distance of 2 kms. from the Railway Station and the area in the vicinity is yet to develop since it is situated near a slum locality which has been classified by him as middle class.

12. After perusing the exercise undertaken by the Valuer, it is seen that in the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 despite the fact that said Report has been discussed extensively, Respondent No.1 has however not considered the same, but concluded on the basis of ready reckoner rate for the year 2023 and determined the market value of the said land at Rs.2,35,00,000/-. This is the sole reason which has compelled Respondent No.1 to arrive at the decision that the said land cannot be sold below Rs.2,35,00,000/-. By virtue of the said order, Respondent No.1 has accorded sanction to the Petitioner – Trust to sell the said land for consideration of Rs.2,35,00,000/- to Respondent No.2.

13. The Valuation Report of the Government approved Valuer S.V. Joglekar and Associates is dated 23.03.2021 and it is appended at page No.17 onwards. It is a detailed Report which takes into account several factors affecting the said land and the Valuer has opined that though according to him the market value of the said land ought to be taken as Rs.1,60,20,000/- keeping in view of the location of the said land and characteristics affecting it, according to him he has opined the distress value of the said land at around Rs.1,44,18,000/-.

14. As against this Respondent No.1 has not produced any material save and except placing reliance on ready reckoner rate. While hearing the parties on 01.07.2025, this Court has noted that Respondent No.2 has increased his bid from Rs.1,65,00,000/- to Rs.1,89,75,000/- by 15%.

15. Mr. Dholakia has also argued that at the time when discussions were taking place during the auction proceedings between Respondent No.2 and representatives of the Petitioner – Trust, Respondent No.2 was persuaded to increase his bid upto Rs.2,00,00,000/- by the Trust which would enure to the benefit of the Petitioner – Trust. In my opinion, merely relying on the ready reckoner rate for the purpose of arriving at the market value of open land may not be a feasible idea primarily because value of open land in the ready reckoner is with respect to the entire area / village without taking into consideration any of the salient features i.e. positive and negative factors affecting the valuation of the said land. It is seen that the said land is situated in Karjat area whereas Petitioner – Trust is based in Mumbai. The said land will have to be protected preserved and augmented, if not utilised by the Petitioner – Trust. The said land was purchased in the year 2009 by the Trust pursuant to which part of the said land was acquired by the Karjat Municipal Council for a designated public purpose. With growing urbanization and development, Mr. Dholakia has expressed the threat of the said land being encroached with slums which would entail further difficulty for the Petitioner – Trust in future. He would submit that even in order to protect the said land today in its present day condition, it is an onerous task to the Petitioner – Trust to incur substantial expenditure with no returns whatsoever. He would submit that funds raised after sale of the said land would enure to the benefit of Petitioner – Trust and its activities.

16. It is seen that the learned Joint Charity Commissioner has accorded sanction for the sale of said land to Respondent No.2 but has stated that the said sale would be subject to the sale consideration being Rs.2,35,00,000/- and not below it. Hence, principally Respondent No.1 has approved and sanctioned the sale of the said land. The only difficulty today would be that if Respondent No.2 who is the highest bidder walks out of the present situation the Petitioner – Trust would undoubtedly suffer the ignominy of undertaking a fresh sale procedure which will entail further delay and uncertainty. That apart the Petitioner Trust will have to also protect and preserve the said land for a further indefinite period if the Respondent No. 2 decides to resile from the transaction / his highest bid which he has also increased before me.

17. What is seen is that the Petitioner – Trust has followed the due process of law while making the Application seeking sanction from Respondent No.1. If Respondent No.1 had any reservations with respect to accepting the valuation of the Valuer in the Valuation Report submitted before him, it was always open to Respondent No.1 to call for a fresh Valuation Report from an independent Valuer, rather Respondent No.1 did not choose to do so and has based his opinion solely on the basis of the ready reckoner value.

18. In that view of the matter, if the Valuation Report appended at page No.17 of the Petition is seen, it is a detailed Valuation Report which has adopted the comparable sales method exercise for comparing the said land, rather features of the said land with similarly placed comparable sale instances in the vicinity of the said land to arrive at its market value. Once that exercise has been done by the Valuer, it cannot be faulted with and deserves acceptance. Valuation is not a precise art or science and it is based upon the guestimate i.e. the opinion of the expert Valuer on the basis of the valuation method adopted which in this case is the Comparable Sales Method i.e. comparative analysis of positive and negative factors affecting the said land with that of the comparable sale instances. Such exercise having been done by the Petitioner – Trust, Respondent No.1 ought to have taken cognizance of the same while returning his finding. That not having been done in the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 therefore renders that part of the order open for challenge. *Per contra* the Respondent No. 1 has not undertaken any exercise for valuation and merely relied upon the Ready Reckoner value.

19. Having considered the overall material placed before me and after having heard Mr. Dholakia, Mr. Gavnekar and Ms. Jadhav, learned AGP, I am of the considered view that increase of 20% over and above the highest bid offered by Respondent No.2 bidder would be a fair market value for the said land in the present case.

20. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, increase of 20% over the highest bid of Rs.1,65,00,000/- received shall come to Rs.1,98,00,000/- i.e. [Rs.1,65,00,000/- + 20% increase (Rs.33,00,000/-) = Rs.1,98,00,000/-].

21. The aforesaid sale consideration of Rs.1,98,00,000/- in my opinion is a fair market value to fetch in respect of the said land considering the various positive and negative factors discussed by the Valuer in his Valuation Report. The Respondent No. 2 is directed to deposit the aforesaid amount of Rs. 1,98,00,000/- for completing the sale transaction in respect of the said land.

22. After this order is dictated in open Court, the only request made by Mr. Gavnekar is that considering the present market conditions, if the Court fixes the market value @ Rs.1,98,00,000/-, Respondent No.2 will require some time to arrange the amount to deposit the same which was even directed by the order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the Joint Charity Commissioner-I. He has therefore persuaded the Court to grant Respondent No.2 six months time to deposit the amount of Rs.1,98,00,000/-.

23. It is seen that the order dated 10.11.2023 had granted six months time to Respondent No.2 and the Petitioner – Trust to complete the transaction from the date of the said order.

24. Hence, considering the aforesaid observations and findings, the order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the Joint Charity Commissioner-I stands sustained, save and except to the extent of substituting the consideration amount of Rs.2,35,00,000/- by Rs.1,98,00,000/- as stated in clause (2) of the operative part of the said order. Rest of the order shall remain the same as it is includes the condition of six months stated in the said order.

25. It is clarified that Petitioner – Trust and Respondent No.2 shall complete the aforesaid transaction within a period of six (6) months from today. All other conditions in the said order shall remain as it is and shall be adhered to by the respective parties.

26. With the above directions, Writ Petition stands allowed and the impugned order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the Joint Charity Commissioner-I stands suitably modified as directed herein above.

27. Writ Petition is allowed and disposed in the above terms.

[MILIND N. JADHAV, J.]

Ajay

RAVINDRA MOHAN AMBERKAR

Digitally signed by RAVINDRA MOHAN AMBERKAR
Date: 2025.07.11 11:44:33 +0530