



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

920 WRIT PETITION NO. 14958 OF 2025

SARDAR MANJEET SINGH JAGAN SINGH

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. G.A.Gadhe, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, for respondent Nos.1 to 4

...

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3271 OF 2026 IN WP/14958/2025

...

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

DATE : 17th MARCH, 2026

ORDER :

. In view of our order dated 17.01.2026 the affidavits have been filed by Mr. Sanjay Digambarrao Warkad, Tahsildar, Nanded, additional affidavit of Mr. Rahul Kashinath Kardile, Collector, Nanded and report of Committee that was appointed by this Court under order dated 17.01.2026 has been annexed along with the legal opinion given by the District Government Pleader, Nanded. It has been concluded *prima facie* that lands

in question were given as Pattedar to Gurudwara. The legal opinion given by District Government Pleader, Nanded also makes a mention apart from the board of the Committee that the record shows that in all 18 survey numbers including Khasra Patrak, Pahani Patrak, 7/12 extract etc. were considered and the Gurudwara was the Pattedar of land Sy.No.86/1. The Government is the owner of Sy.No.86/2, 93, however, the revenue record also shows the names of some private individuals, those names have been included without following any legal procedure and, therefore, the opinion has been given by District Government Pleader that the action needs to be taken under Section 53 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code.

2 Learned AGP, upon instructions from Sanjay Digambarrao Warkad, Tahsildar, Nanded, submits that the action under Section 53 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code would start from the next week and taking into consideration the number of persons i.e. more than 10000, who are required to be heard, it will take at least one year to complete the said procedure.

3 If we consider the documents, those have been annexed, the communication dated 20.10.2023 by Deputy Collector (General), Nanded had started action under Section 53 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code on the basis of the application by the present petitioner. The directions were

given to Tahsildar, Nanded to start the said action. Tahsildar in turn directed Circle Officer, Nanded City and Talathi, Sajja Nanded had given further directions to take the action. Surprisingly, the Circle Officer, Nanded City again made a communication to the petitioner and informed him that the powers under Section 53 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code are with the Collector. Upon the report the further action would be taken. It appears that this is the best way that was adopted by a Circle Officer to avoid the action. Now, we do not want that such avoiding tactics should be followed. We, therefore, direct respondent No.2 – Collector, Nanded to give clear instructions and assign the inquiry to a particular officer, who would conduct the entire exercise within a period of six months from today.

4 We are making it clear that delayed tactics will not be allowed and the appropriate action then will be taken against such officer, who would prolong the matter unnecessarily.

5 With these directions, we **dispose of** the writ petition.

6 Pending Civil Application for intervention stands disposed of.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)

agd