

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO.5553 OF 2026**

Kamal Kedu Khare and Anr. ... Petitioners  
versus  
Narayanrao Ganpatrao Vinchurkar and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Nikhil M. Pujari, for Petitioners.  
Mrs. M.S.Srivastava, AGP for State.

**CORAM: N.J.JAMADAR, J.**

**DATE : 28 APRIL 2026**

**P.C.**

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the Petitioners.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 6 February 2024 passed by the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal (MRT), in Tenancy Revision No.TNC/REV/NSK/L-106/2022.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners submits that, though the Petitioners, who were arrayed as Respondent Nos.13 and 14 before the MRT, were shown to be present before the MRT, and also executed the consent terms, they were not present and their signatures on the consent terms have been forged.
4. If these are the allegations, the proper course for the Petitioners would be to file appropriate proceedings before the MRT, Mumbai, raising the grievance that they were not present before the MRT, when the consent terms

SWAROOP  
SHARAD  
PHADKE

Digitally signed by  
SWAROOP  
SHARAD PHADKE  
Date: 2026.05.01  
11:24:30 +0530

were accepted, and that the revision application was disposed on the basis of the forged consent terms.

5. The Writ Petition, thus, stands disposed with liberty to the Petitioners to prefer an appropriate application before the MRT in the said Tenancy Revision.

6. In the event, such an application is filed, the MRT is requested to hear and decide the same on its own merits and in accordance with law.

7. It is clarified that, this court has not entered into the merits of the matter.

**( N.J.JAMADAR, J. )**