



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

104 WRIT PETITION NO. 10741 OF 2022

PADMATAI CHINTAMANI MAHARAJ

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH DISTRICT COLLECTOR
AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Mrigesh D. Narwadkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for Respondent-State.

Mr. S. S. Gangakhedkar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 and 5.

...

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10335 OF 2025
IN CA/7506/2025

AMRUT SIDDHA MAHARAJ AND ANOTHER

VERSUS

PADMATAI CHINTAMANI MAHARAJ DIED HER LRS SWANAND
CHINTAMANI MAHARAJ AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Shailendra S. Gangakhedkar, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for Respondent-State.

Mr. M. D. Narwadkar, for the Petitioner in WP.

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 23rd FEBRUARY, 2026

PC:-

1. Motion is made for speaking to minutes in respect of order dated 18.02.2026.

2. It is submitted that in the order dated 18.02.2026, in paragraph No.4, the following words:

“Accordingly, the order dated 19.08.2022 passed by the learned

Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Aurangabad in Case No.98-B-2020-Hingoli as well as the order dated 18.10.2005 passed by the Deputy Collector (Imam Abolition), Parbhani and order dated 13.12.2017, the Sub-Divisional Officer, Vasmat are hereby quashed and set aside.”

have been wrongly mentioned instead of:-

“Accordingly, the order dated 19.08.2022 passed by the learned Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Aurangabad in Case No.98-B-2020-Hingoli as well as the order dated 16.01.2020 passed by the Deputy Collector (Inam Abolition), Hingoli and order dated 13.12.2017 passed by the Sub-Divisional Officer, Vasmat are hereby quashed and set aside.”

3. In view of the above submissions, paragraph No.4 of the order dated 18.02.2026 shall stand substituted by the corrected paragraph reproduced hereinabove.

4. Necessary corrections be carried out and the corrected order be uploaded accordingly.

5. The Motion is disposed of.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)