



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

4 WRIT PETITION NO.891 OF 2026

Raosaheb Laxman Gadge

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Honble Minister And Others

...
Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Counsel i/b Mr. Sanjay A. Nandure, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondents/State.

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &

HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 22 JANUARY 2026

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed to give directions to respondent No.1 to decide the appeal/revision filed by the petitioner within stipulated period.

2 Learned AGP waives notice for respondent No.1 and upon instructions from respondent No.1 makes a statement that respondent No.1 would decide the appeal/revision of the petitioner within a period of three months from today.

3. We take the said statement as undertaking and direct respondent No.1 to decide the appeal/revision of the petitioner within a period of

three months from today.

4. Learned Senior Counsel Mr. V. D. Hon instructed by learned Advocate Mr. Sanjay A. Nandure for the petitioner submits that by impugned communication dated 19.01.2026, now the action is being taken for demolition and, therefore, protection needs to be granted.

5. First of all, we are absolutely not appreciating the stand taken by the petitioner. He filed the appeal in 2021 and also filed the stay application on 26.02.2021. When enquiry has been made, the learned Senior Counsel states that the Hon'ble Minister had not taken up the matter, though pressed. Again on 13.01.2026, second stay application has been filed.

6. Taking into consideration the statement that has been made on behalf of respondent No.1 that the revision would be decided within a period of three months and the fact that Hon'ble Minister ought to have considered the prayer for stay when separate application in the revision was made on 26.02.2021, we direct the Hon'ble Minister that the decision on the stay application be taken within a period of 15 days from today and till then respondent No.3 to maintain *status quo* in respect of the property to the extent of petitioner.

7. We further make it clear that this is the stop gap arrangement and after the decision on the stay application by Hon'ble Minister, the said order would prevail.

8. With these directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm