



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

40 WRIT PETITION NO.1117 OF 2026

1. Jagdish Suresh Shirsath
 2. Sarjerao Baburao Moharnor
- .. Petitioners**

Versus

Collector, Beed

.. Respondent

...

Mr. Shashikant E. Shekade, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. S. B. Narwade, AGP for Respondent/State.

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 02 FEBRUARY 2026

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed for directions to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 16.10.2025 and also direction against the respondents to take appropriate action against the revenue officers, who are responsible for the fraud conducted in illegal excavation of sand at the village Manur, Taluka Shirur, District Beed.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner.

3. First of all, it appears that representation was made on 23.11.2022 and test panchanama has been drawn on 30.11.2022, for which it appears that thereafter the petitioners have not taken any action. Now, it is stated that those persons, who are excavating the sand, have started the excavation once again and, therefore, representation has been filed on 15.10.2025. Except representation, there is nothing on record to support the contention of the petitioners. When the petitioners say that it is the theft of the sand and illegal excavation, the petitioners are free to lodge the report with the police. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that many villagers have signed the representation. Mere signing of the representation will not do. If those persons, who are signatory, unite and resist the act, then definitely the persons who are allegedly excavating the sand would get lesson. Another limb of argument was that petitioners' land is getting affected due to the land mafias for which the petitioners should approach the Civil Court and without any evidence, blind statement is made that some revenue officials have joined the hands with land mafias in illegal excavation of the sand from the lands of the petitioners. For such reckless statements, in fact we would have imposed cost upon the petitioners. Without evidence the petitioners are not supposed to make any statement, so also the learned Advocate representing them ought to have restrained them from making such

statements. However, our observations are suffice. We do not find any merit in the matter. No case is made out for exercise of powers under Article 226 of Constitution of India much less under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

4. The writ petition stands dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm