

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10611 OF 2025

LAXMI
SUBHASH
SONTAKKE

Digitally signed by
LAXMI SUBHASH
SONTAKKE
Date: 2025.10.06
12:35:16 +0530

Ramchandra B. Sathe & Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Maharashtra

...Respondents

Mr. Sujay Palshikar for Petitioner.

Ms. Savita Prabhune, AGP for Respondent-State.

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
AARTI SATHE, JJ.

DATE: 24th September 2025

P.C.

1. This Petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the following substantive relief, which reads thus:-

“a. Directing the Respondent No.1 to decide the revision application no. RTS/3424/3350/PRA KRA/307/J-5 pending on the desk of the Hon’ble Minister (Revenue) Mantralaya, as expeditiously as possible with in a time bound period.”

2. The Petitioners are primarily aggrieved by the inaction on the part of Respondent No.1 i.e. the Minister, Revenue and Forest Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai, in not passing any judgment/order in respect of the Revision Application filed before him on 6th June 2024 bearing No. RTS/3424/3350/PRA KRA/307/J-5, inspite of the fact that the matter was heard before him and it was orally informed on 8th October 2024 to the Petitioner that the matter was closed for judgment. It is hence the Petitioner’s grievance that the matter has been heard way

back in 2024 and has been closed for judgment, yet the order/judgment thereon has not been passed by Respondent No.1.

3. This Revision Application has been filed before Respondent No.1 by the Petitioners being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the order of the learned Divisional Commissioner in respect of the dispute regarding the land which has come to the Petitioners by way of inheritance some time in 1987. In respect of the aforesaid land, considerable litigation has taken place and the Revision Application filed before Respondent No.1 is primarily in respect thereof, which was earlier heard and closed for judgment. The grievance of the Petitioners is that such Revision Application needs to be disposed of expeditiously and since considerable period of time has lapsed since the last hearing held before Respondent No.1, it is imperative that the said Revision Application be decided afresh, as expeditiously as possible, so that no further prejudice will be caused to the Petitioner.

4. In our view considering the limited relief that the Petitioner seeks in the present Petition and although there being no written opposition/reply of the Respondents, considering the nature of the orders which are proposed to be passed, no prejudice would be caused to the Respondents. The following order would serve the ends of justice:-

ORDER

i. We direct Respondent No.1 i.e. the Minister, Revenue and Forest Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai, to consider and decide the pending Revision Application bearing No. RTS/3424/3350/PRA KRA/307/J-5 filed on 6th June

2024, in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of four weeks from the date this order is made available to the said Respondent by the Petitioners.

ii. We further direct that the Revision Application bearing No. RTS/3424/3350/PRA KRA/307/J-5 be heard afresh and further submissions and documents which are needed to be placed on record, be allowed by Respondent No.1 at the time of hearing of the said Revision Application. Let all the parties be heard.

iii. All rights and contentions of the parties are expressly kept open.

iv. The Petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms. No costs.

(AARTI SATHE, J.)

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)