

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 14551 OF 2025**

Umroli Grampanchayat

...Petitioner

Versus

The Ministry of Revenue and Forest & Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Atul Damle, Senior Advocate i/by Mr. Satyajeet H. Joshi,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Karan Thorat, 'B' Panel Counsel for the Respondent/State.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE**&****ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.****DATE : 5th DECEMBER, 2025****P.C. :-**

1. The Petitioner is a Grampanchayat, which has assailed the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer ('SDO'), Palghar dated 17th September 2025, which is said to have been passed under a specific written dictate of the District Collector, Palghar dated 6th August 2025. He has directed the SDO to delete the name of the Petitioner from the Mutation Entry and the land in the name of the State Government. The entries in favour of the Petitioners recorded in 1974, are sought to be altered.

2. Their problem is multiplied by the fact that the order of the SDO has to be assailed before the District Collector in view of the Scheduled (E) to Section 247 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 (**'MLRC, 1966'**). The learned Senior Advocate rightly submits that since the District Collector has ordered the SDO, the Petitioners can not expect any different order, if they approach the said authority.

3. The learned AGP vehemently opposes this Petition and submits that the Petition may not be entertained since the Petitioner has a statutory efficacious remedy under Section 247 read with Schedule (E) under the MLRC, 1966.

4. The statutory regime of challenging the orders under the MLRC, 1966 is well set under Section 247. This Court has delivered a Judgment in *Gurudassing Nawoosing Panjwani vs. State of Maharashtra and others*, 2016 (2) SCC 213, concluding that even a second revision is permissible. In the backdrop of the District Collector having involved himself in the process, the Petitioner will have to be granted the liberty to assail the impugned order passed by the SDO, before the Divisional Commissioner, Konkan Division.

5. In view of the above, the learned Senior Advocate has taken instructions from the Petitioner and submits that the Petitioner would avail of the said remedy by withdrawing this Petition. However, he prays that this Court may observe that the Divisional Commissioner would not be influenced by the dictate of the District Collector and would decide the revision on its own merits and deal with all the contentions of the Petitioner, more specifically, the fact that a Mutation Entry of 1974 is sought to be altered after 51 years.

6. Thus, this **Writ Petition is disposed off** as withdrawn, with liberty. The Divisional Commissioner would independently decide the revision being filed by the Petitioner, on its own merit and deal with all the contentions raised therein, more specifically, the aspect of delay and the fact that a Mutation Entry is sought to be altered after 51 years. A reasoned order shall be passed on the merits of the matter.

7. Needless to state, as the Mutation Entries have now been changed pursuant to the impugned order, the State/Revenue Authority shall maintain status quo and would not precipitate the issue any further until the revision is decided by the Divisional

Commissioner. In the event, the issue of limitation arises, the time spent by the Petitioner before this Court from the date of the filing of this Petition till the passing of this order, shall be excused.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)