



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 6517 OF 2025**

Dhiraj s/o Banduji Doye Vs State of Maharashtra and others.

---

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of  
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders  
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

---

Mr. P.D. Meghe, counsel for petitioner.

Mr. S.M. Ukey, Additional G.P. for respondent/State.

**CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR and RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.**

**DATE : 04/11/2025**

1. The petitioner claims to be the owner of land in question, i.e. land survey no. 245 situated at Mouza Vijasan Tah. Bhadravati, District Chandrapur.

2. A Will dated 20/01/2011 was executed by Smt Savitri Wasudeo Doye in the name of the petitioner, on the basis of a Will dated 6/05/1992 executed in her favour by Shri Wasudeo Doye, who died on 16/01/1994.

3. After the death of Savitri Doye, the name of the petitioner was mutated vide entry no. 5667 on 24/02/2018. Thereafter, the respondent No.3 issued a letter in the name of Savitri Doye, informing that a meeting was scheduled for handing over the plot in question for Bhadravati Industrial Area i.e. in favour of respondent No.4.

4. The respondent No. 2, by letter dated 02/04/2025, informed the petitioner that an award had been passed

against Savitribai Wasudeo Doye in a land acquisition matter and since the name of the petitioner is now recorded in the 7/12 extract, he was asked to attend the office of respondent No. 3 on 03/04/2025.

5. According to the petitioner, since the award was passed in the year 1997-98, it has lapsed as possession was not taken.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner communicated this fact to the respondent No.3. However, there is no response from respondent No.3 on the petitioner's objection. It appears from the documents annexed along with the petition (at page 33) that Sub-Divisional Officer had fixed the matter for hearing on 22/09/2025. According to the petitioner, nothing happened on that date in that matter, and till date, there is no decision on the objection raised by the petitioner regarding lapsing of the award.

7. Shri P.D. Meghe, learned counsel for the petitioner, expressed an apprehension that the respondents may mutate the name of respondent No.4 at any time by removing the name of the petitioner.

8. Shri S.M. Ukey, learned Additional Government Pleader is not disputing the above referred facts.

9. In that view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the petition can be disposed of with a direction to the respondents to decide the objection of the petitioner

regarding lapsing of award within stipulated period, and before mutating the name of respondent No.4.

Accordingly, we pass the following order.

- a] The writ petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.5 to decide the objection raised by the petitioner.
- b] The notice/objection dated 04/04/2025, as regards the lapsing of the award, shall be decided within a period of four weeks from the date of communication of this order. Till the decision on this notice/objection of the petitioner, the respondents are directed not to mutate the name of respondent No.4 by removing the name of petitioner, in revenue record.
- c] The petitioner undertakes to communicate this order to the respondent No.5 within a period of one week from today.

( RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)