



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 796 OF 2025

(Rajkumar s/o Dnyandeo Bhise & Anr. Vs. Additional Commissioner, Amravati Division & Ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. M.V. Bute, Counsel for the petitioners.
Ms P.C. Bawankule, A.G.P for respondent nos. 1 to 5/State.

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE, J.
FEBRUARY 13, 2025

Heard.

2] The learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no.1 had, in the year 2008, purchased the disputed property from respondent no.6, viz., property bearing Gat No. 18 admeasuring 0.81 R out of 2.34 H.R. Thereafter, in the year 2009, he sold the said land to respondent no.6, and on 13/4/2010, petitioner no.1 again purchased the said land from respondent no.6 through registered sale deed. The learned Counsel further submits that petitioner no.1 has transferred this land in favour of petitioner no.2 through partition deed, which is not registered. He further submits that the Circle Inspector had taken cognizance of this unregistered document and mutated name of petitioner no.2. The Sub-Divisional Officer has set it aside. The Sub-Divisional Officer, however, has taken note of the reconveyance of land by petitioner no.1 in favour of respondent no.6 made in the year 2009 and held that since the land is reconvened, the petitioner no.1 could not have

transferred the land to petitioner no.2 and accordingly set aside the mutation entry recorded in the name of petitioner no.2.

3] Though the reasons assigned appears to be incorrect inasmuch as the Sub-Divisional Officer has not taken cognizance of the sale deed executed in the year 2010 by respondent no.6 in favour of petitioner no.1, the fact remains that the transfer of land by petitioner no.1 in favour of petitioner no.2 by way of unregistered partition deed is not a valid conveyance and will not entitled petitioner no.2 to get her name mutated in the revenue records.

4] That being so, the order passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer is upheld, though for difference reasons. In other words, there is no merit in the petition. The petition is dismissed. No costs.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

Sumit