



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO.9625 OF 2025**

Aum Developers ... Petitioner  
versus  
State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Surel Shah, Sr. Advocate with Ms. Minal Chandnani, for Petitioner.  
Ms. Sulbha Chipade, AGP for Respondent No.1.

**CORAM: N.J.JAMADAR, J.**

**DATE : 22 JULY 2025**

**P.C.**

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to a notice dated 16 May 2025 issued by the State of Maharashtra in RTS Revision Application No.RTS-3423/26/Pra.Kra-22/J-5, whereby the notices of the said proceedings were issued to as many as 88 persons.
3. This Petition has a prelude. Mutation Entry Nos.6663, 6664, 6665 and 6666 were certified in the year 2009 on the basis of the registered instrument. Respondent Nos.4 to 6 preferred revision against the certification of those mutation entries. Since the revisional powers were invoked after a period of five years, a proposal was sent to the State Government for granting permission to exercise the power of revision. By a communication dated 4 October 2023, the State Government has accorded its permission to exercise

the power of revision. The Petitioner had challenge the said order by filing WP No.1258 of 2025. By an order dated 24 March 2025, with the consent of the parties, the said order dated 4 October 2023, was quashed and set aside and the State Government (R1) was directed to pass a reasoned order, after providing an opportunity of hearing to all the parties.

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, initially notices were issued to the persons who were the parties to the Writ Petition and who had sought revision of the certification of the mutation entries. It appears that, subsequently, by the impugned notice dated 16 May 2025, the State Government issued notices to as many as 88 persons. The Petitioner filed an application seeking determination of the locus of the parties to whom the notices were issued (Exh.7). However on 19 June 2025, the proceeding was closed for orders, after granting liberty to the parties to file written submissions within a period of seven days. Roznama of the proceeding dated 19 June 2025 indicates that, many of the parties who were served with the notice dated 16 May 2025 appeared before the State Government.

5. The grievance of the Petitioner is that the proceeding was closed for orders without determining the objection of the Petitioner to the impleadment and hearing of the parties who have no concern with the proceeding. As the proceeding has been closed for final orders, the Petitioner would be left in the lurch in the event on the basis of the contentions of those parties, the

proceeding is finally decided by the State Government.

6. Evidently, initially notice dated 30 April 2025 was issued to those persons who had invoked revisional jurisdiction and who were the parties before this Court in WP No.1258 of 2025. The record does not equip the Court to ascertain the reason which weighed with the State Government in issuing notice to as many as 88 persons. Roznama dated 19 June 2025 further indicates that few of those persons appeared before the State Government and after hearing the parties, the proceeding came to be closed for orders.

7. In these circumstances, it is necessary that the objection filed by the Petitioner to the impleadment and hearing of the parties, other than the parties to whom the notices were issued on 30 April 2025, is determined before the proceeding is finally decided by the State Government.

8. In this view of the matter, the Court deems it appropriate to direct the State Government to decide the objection of the Petitioner (Exh.7) before the proceeding is finally decided, after providing an opportunity of hearing to the parties.

9. Let the parties appear before the State Government on 30 July 2025.

10. Respondent No.1 shall decide the said objection of the Petitioner after providing an opportunity of hearing to the parties before finally deciding the proceeding No.RTS-3423/26/Pra.Kra-22/J-5.

11. The Writ Petition accordingly stands disposed.
12. The parties to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

**( N.J.JAMADAR, J. )**