



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.9072 OF 2025

Uttam Namdev Jagtap

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors.

.... Respondents

Adv. Valmiky H. Narvekar, for the petitioner.

Shri K. S. Thorat, 'B' Panel Counsel, for the respondent-State.

CORAM : M. S. KARNIK &
S. M. MODAK, JJ.

DATE : 17th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The petitioner has filed the present petition for direction to respondent No.4 for deciding the application for modification of the 7/12 extract of his Gat No.100 situated at Maralgoi, Taluka Niphad afresh. In paragraphs 3 to 5, the following stand has been taken by the respondent No.4 vide the affidavit dated 4th March 2026 :-

“3) I say that, the State of Maharashtra has issued the Government Resolution on 30.04.2025 and thereby directed to implement "Jivant Satbara Mohim". I say that, as per above said government resolution the State Government has directed for modification and updating of the record of rights under the different heads as mention in the government

resolution. I say that, as per para 4 of the above said government resolution the State Government has directed for removal of the Banding/Aycut charges of the land and set free the record of rights from such kind of charge. Hereto annexed and marked as Exhibit 'RI' is photo copy of the Government Resolution dated 30.04.2025.

4) I say that, so far as the prayer of the Petitioner is concerned, prayer of the Petitioner is squarely covered under the government resolution Exhibit R1. Hence, same can be positively sort out.

5) I say that, I hereby assured to positively consider the request of the Petitioner as per the guideline of the government resolution Exhibit R1 and shall take appropriate decision within period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order in present writ petition.”

3. It is the grievance of the petitioner that despite the removal of the Bunding/Aycut charges in terms of the Government Resolution (G.R.), the 7/12 extract still indicates in the occupants column that the State of Maharashtra is in possession. This, according to the learned counsel for the petitioner, defeats the G.R. We prima facie find substance in the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that once the loan has been repaid, in terms of the G.R., the Bunding/Aycut charges have to be removed from the other rights column. Once the charge has gone and the petitioner is in possession, prima facie, according to us there is no question of the name of the State Government in the 7/12 extract to be shown as an occupier or in possession.

4. Considering the affidavit dated 4th March 2026 filed by the respondent No.4 and in deference to what has been fairly stated in the affidavit that the appropriate decision within a period of four weeks shall be taken, we have no manner of doubt that the respondent No.4 shall take the necessary steps and ensure that the name of the State Government is removed from the 7/12 extract and necessary corrections are made in the record of rights.
5. In case the respondent No.4 is of the opinion that the materials and the previous record justify the retention of the name of the State Government, then the reasons should be spelt out for retaining the name of the State Government in the 7/12 extract, despite the petitioner having repaid the entire loan.
6. Liberty to apply in case of difficulty.
7. The writ petition is disposed of.

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)