

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 9847 OF 2025

Shrikrishna Jaganath Sadwelkar ... Petitioner

V/s.

Avinash Kashinath Sadwelkar and ... Respondents
Ors.

Mr. Yatin Kochare I.by Sidheshwar N. Biradar, for the petitioner.
Mr. J.P. Patil, AGP, for the State.

CORAM : N.J. JAMADAR, J.
DATE : 23rd JULY 2025

Digitally
signed by
VARSHA
DEEPAK
GAIKWAD
Date:
2025.08.02
15:38:38
+0530

PC:

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. This Court expressed its disinclination to entertain the petition as the petitioner has an efficacious remedy under the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code against the order dated 7th April, 2025 passed by the Additional Collector, Sindhudurg. It is imperative to note that the petitioner had initially challenged the order passed by the Circle Officer on 7th December, 2021, thereby certifying Mutation Entry No. 455 before the Sub-Divisional Officer, Sawantwadi and the said appeal filed by the petitioner was allowed by the Sub-Divisional Officer by a

judgment and order dated 19th January, 2024 and against the said order the respondents had preferred an appeal i.e. RTS Appeal No. 19 of 2024 in which the impugned order came to be passed. Evidently, it was the petitioner, who had initially invoked the jurisdiction of the authorities under the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 and hence it is now not open for the petitioner to urge that the Court should exercise extraordinary jurisdiction after the Appellate Authority passed an order against the petitioner.

3. The time spent by the petitioner in prosecuting this petition may be accounted for under Section 14 of the Limitation Act, in the event the question of limitation arises in filing the revision application.

4. With the aforesaid clarification, the petition stands disposed.

5. In the event such an application is filed, the same be decided as expeditiously as possible.

(N.J. JAMADAR, J)