IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.15847 OF 2025

Vimal Babu Lande and another … Petitioners

Vs.

State of Maharashtra through its Principal Secretary
Revenue and Forest Department and others … Respondents

Mr. Siddhartha Ronghe for Petitioners.

Mr. A. I. Patel, Additional GP a/w. Ms. P. M. Joshi-Deshpande, AGP for Respondents-State.

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

DATE : MARCH 07, 2026

P.C. :

. Heard Mr. Ronghe, learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. The grievance of the petitioners appears to be in respect of a land acquisition award passed as far back as on 16.08.1982.

3. Even according to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners, first time in the year 2012, a grievance on behalf of the petitioners was raised. Thereafter, it appears that the petitioners have been approaching the authorities and by order dated 08.09.2023, the Collector, Pune has considered the grievance of the petitioners and recorded reasons as to why the claim made on behalf of the petitioners is without any substance.

MINAL SANDIP PARAB Digitally signed by MINAL SANDIP PARAB Date: 2026.03.07 16:56:39 +0530

4. The crux of the grievance of the petitioners is that while land from Survey Nos.61/1 and 61/3 of Mauje - Nigadi, District - Pune was acquired, possession was taken and compensation was paid, as a matter of fact, a larger piece of land was acquired. According to the petitioners,

an impression was given during the land acquisition proceedings, culminating into the award that only part of the said survey numbers was acquired, but the authorities appear to be claiming that the entire land in the said survey numbers was acquired.

5. We find a tendency on the part of citizens of this country to approach the Writ Court after decades, raking up issues pertaining to land acquisition proceedings that took place 30 to 40 years ago.

6. There is no doubt that right to property under Article 300-A of the Constitution of India has been recognized by the Supreme Court and this Court as a constitutional right and also a facet of human right. However, we find that on some occasions litigants are knocking the doors of the Writ Court after decades to rake up issues that they should have raised immediately after the acquisition proceedings culminated into the award. In this case also, the petitioners or their predecessors collected the compensation in pursuance of the award dated 16.08.1982 and handed over possession of the acquired land. Yet, the first occasion when they raised their grievance was in the year 2012, which was at least 30 years after the land acquisition award was passed.

7. We find that in the order dated 08.09.2023, the Collector has considered the material and passed a reasoned order. It is only because the petitioners claim that the part of their land has been acquired without compensation that we are inclined to examine the issues sought to be raised by the petitioners.

8. But it is made clear that if the material placed on record by the respondents demonstrates that there is no substance in the claim raised by the petitioners, this Court will impose heavy costs on the petitioners.

9. Issue notice, returnable on 08.04.2026.

10. Mr. Patel, learned Additional GP waives notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 5-State.

11. Additionally, the petitioners are permitted to serve respondent Nos.7 to 9 by way of private service and to file affidavit of service before the next date of listing.

12. Meanwhile, the respondents are at liberty to file reply affidavits.

13. The petitioners are also directed to place on record a photocopy of the original award dated 16.08.1982 with an additional affidavit before the next date of listing.

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

Minal Parab