IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 13891 OF 2026

Parvati Kantilal Patil and others … Petitioners

vs.

The State of Maharashtra, Thr. Dept. of Land Acquisition and Forest and others … Respondents

Mr. Avinash Fatangare a/w. Ms. Archana Shelar for petitioners.
Ms. Tanu N. Bhatia, AGP for respondents – State authorities.
Ms. Aparna D. Vhatkar for respondent No.3.
Mr. Jeet Gandhi a/w. Mr. Akash Gupta for respondent No.4.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ
DATE : 19th OCTOBER, 2026

P.C. :

. By this petition, the petitioners have challenged a letter/order dated 15.06.2026 issued by respondent No.2 – Sub-divisional Officer and Competent Authority for Land Acquisition (SDO). By the said order, the said respondent has disposed of an application filed by one Vikas Shravan Patil. It is recorded in the impugned order that the said Vikas Shravan Patil did not submit any document in support of a communication dated 19.05.2026 submitted by him, claiming interest in the subject lands that were acquired.

2. At the outset, the learned AGP has taken preliminary objection with regard to the present petition to the effect that the said Vikas Shravan Patil is not a petitioner in this petition. It submitted that in any case, the application dated 19.05.2026 at Exhibit K submitted by the said Vikas Shravan Patil was a simple one-para submission, staking claim in the subject lands and demanding hearing from

PRIYA KAMBLI Digitally signed by PRIYA KAMBLI Date: 2026.10.19 18:06:04 +0530

respondent No.2 – SDO. No documents were submitted along with the said application.

3. It is further submitted that consent award was dated 16.06.2026 and as on today, the compensation amount has already been disbursed in favour of respondent No.4.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the said Vikas Shravan Patil is not a party in this writ petition, his father Shravan Parshuram Patil is petitioner No.6.

5. We are of the opinion that this writ petition is defective, as the person aggrieved i.e. Vikas Shravan Patil is not even a party (petitioner) in the present petition.

5. The petitioners should have approached the respondent No.2 to stake their claim in respect of the subject property. On this short ground, we are inclined to dismiss the writ petition.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is dismissed.

7. However, the petitioners would be at liberty to raise their claims, if any, in accordance with law before the competent authority/sub-divisional officer. This Court is not expressing any opinion in that regard.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.) (MANISH PITALE, J.)

Priya Kambli