



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1025 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 62 OF 2026  
IN WP/3393/2017

BHAIRU VISHNU SURYAWANSHI

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND  
OTHERS

...

Mr. A. N. Irpatgire, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. R. B. Dhaware, AGP for Respondent-State.

Mr. S. G. Jadhavar, Advocate for Respondent No.5 in WP.

Mr. V. M. Mane, Advocate for Respondent Nos.9 to 11 in WP.

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 11<sup>th</sup> JUNE, 2026

PC.:-

1. Heard learned Advocates for the respective parties.
2. Mr. A. N. Irpatgire, learned Advocate for the Petitioner invited the Court's attention to its earlier order dated 11.03.2026 passed in Writ Petition Nos.3393 of 2017 and 10002 of 2018. The petitioner's grievance was specifically directed against the observation recorded in paragraph 7 of that order, wherein the learned Advocate for Respondent No.5 had stated that possession of the land had been taken by the landlord from the tenants in the year 1963.
3. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner further invited the Court's attention to the application filed by the Respondents, particularly page No.18 of Tenancy Petition No.25 of 1996, wherein it

was stated that the tenants had been forcibly dispossessed during the years 1976–1977. He also relied upon paragraph Nos.16 and 17 of the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.3849 of 2012. On the basis of these documents, he contended that the statement made on behalf of the Respondents that possession had been taken by the landlord in 1963 was contrary to their own pleadings. He, therefore, submitted that the order dated 11.03.2026 suffered from an apparent error on the face of the record and prayed that the review application be allowed by recalling the said order.

4. After hearing the learned Advocates for the respective parties and upon perusing the order passed by this Court as well as the copy of the tenancy application, I find that paragraph No.7 of the order merely records the statement made on behalf of Respondent No.5 that the boundaries were required to be ascertained in view of the fact that possession had been taken from the landlord in the year 1963. In these circumstances, I am of the view that the Petitioner has failed to point out any apparent error committed by this Court while passing the said order.

5. In view of the foregoing discussion, I do not find any error apparent on the face of the record in the order sought to be reviewed. Consequently, no case is made out for entertaining the review application and the same deserves to be rejected.

6. Hence, the present review application is dismissed. No order

as to costs.

7. Learned Advocate for the Petitioner sought an extension of time for a further period of six weeks. However, considering that the original order was passed on 11.03.2026 and sufficient time has already elapsed thereafter, I am not inclined to grant any further extension.

**(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)**

*Tauseef*