



drp

{1}

wp1993-26.doc

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.1993 OF 2026

Jalil Mehamood Sayyad and Another

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others

RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr. R. C. Brahmarkar h/f Mr. N. L. Jadhav, Advocate for
Petitioners

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

.....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.J.

DATE : 24th FEBRUARY, 2026

ORDER (PER HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) :

1. Leave to amend. Amendment to be carried out forthwith.
2. Present Petition is filed for the following reliefs:

“C. It may kindly be held and declared that the impugned Government Resolution bearing No. TP/3320/616/2020/21/cr-103/2020-22/IP/Publication / UD-30 in respect of Schedule-B, EP-11 dtd. 11.02.2025 is illegal, arbitrary, unreasonable and same may be quashed and set aside.

D. The respondent No.3 may kindly be directed to decide the complaint cum representation dated 10.03.2025, within three months, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the Petitioners."

3. At the outset, learned Advocate appearing for the Petitioners submits that, the Petitioners do not press prayer clause "C". He further argues that objections to the Development Plan have been raised by the Petitioners, by filing complaint / representation dated 10th March, 2025 and the same is pending with the office of Respondent No.3 till date. He submits that the directions be issued to Respondent No.3 to decide the objections raised by the Petitioners within a period of 3 months.

4. Learned AGP appearing for Respondents No.1 to 5 submits that hearing of the objections to the Development Plan has not begun and there is likelihood to receive several objections from the citizens. This exercise of deciding the objections will take at least a period of one year for Respondent No.3. We record the statement of the learned AGP.

5. Section 31 sub clause (3) of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 prescribes that the State Government shall, before according sanction to the Draft Development Plan, take into consideration such objections and suggestions and the report of the officer. The time limit provided for according sanction to the modification and to take final decision regarding modification by the State Government, is one year from the date of receipt of the report from the officer appointed under sub section (2). The objections of the Petitioners are pending with Respondent No.3 since 10th March, 2025 and, therefore, we direct Respondent No.3 to decide the objections of the Petitioners as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 8 months from today. With these directions, the Writ Petition stands disposed of.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR)
JUDGE

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI)
JUDGE