

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 1006 OF 2026**

Ramdas Dnyanoba Buchade ... Petitioner
vs.
State of Maharashtra,
Thr. the Ministry of Revenue and Forest, & ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Sandeep Phatak for petitioner.

Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. G. R. Raghuwanshi, AGP for respondents – State authorities.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ**

DATE : 27th APRIL, 2026

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned AGP for respondents – State authorities.

2. The petitioner approached this Court and claimed urgency in the matter on 05.03.2026, as notice was earlier issued by an order dated 29.01.2026. It was submitted that the petitioner was apprehending dispossession.

3. Today when the petition was taken up for consideration, we find that there are two proceedings pending in the context of the rights claimed by the petitioner in the subject land. One pertains to a proceeding pending before the Sub-divisional Officer under the provisions of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966, with regard to a mutation entry. The other proceeding is a suit bearing Special Civil Suit No.32 of 2018 pending before the Civil Judge Senior Division, Pune, wherein the petitioner has challenged

registered sale deeds executed by his vendor in favour of a third party.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that although his name is not reflected in the mutation entry and the revenue record as on today, but he has sufficient documents in his favour, including registered documents, to demonstrate that he is the owner and in possession of the subject land. On this basis, it is submitted that the petitioner is entitled to being issued notice by the respondent authorities, as they intend to acquire part of the land for road widening.

5. During the course of arguments, it was brought to our notice that in response to a public notice issued by respondent No.3 – Sub-divisional Officer, the petitioner has submitted his objection on 08.12.2025. This Court is of the opinion that an appropriate direction can be issued to respondent No.3 to consider and decide the objection in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of, by directing respondent No.3 – Sub-divisional Officer to decide the objection dated 08.12.2025 submitted by the petitioner in response to the public notice, strictly in accordance with law.

7. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter and the respondent No.3 – Sub-divisional Officer shall decide the objection without being influenced by the order passed by this Court.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)