IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.3514 OF 2025

ARJUN S/O. GULABRAO DORLE
VERSUS
COLLECTOR, NAGPUR AND OTHERS

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	*Court's or Judge's orders*

Mr. D.G. Paunikar, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. H.R. Dhumale, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 3-State.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.
DATED : 06th FEBRUARY 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner as well as learned AGP for respondent Nos.1 to 3-State.

2. The petitioner's limited grievance in the instant petition is the observations in paragraph No.6, recorded by the Member (Judicial), Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Nagpur, in its final judgment and order dated 13.12.2024, passed in Ceiling Appeal No. APL/Ceiling/NGP-04/2023, labeling the conduct of the appellant therein (petitioner herein) as 'blackmailing' the respondent.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the controversy before the Tribunal was with respect to the sale deed and

mutation of the property and observations about the conduct of the petitioner by labeling his conduct as a blackmailing tactics is absolutely unwarranted and without any basis.

4. Notice of this petition was served on all the respondents, however, nobody appears on behalf of contesting respondent Nos.4 and 5. By order dated 04.02.2026, in order to afford one opportunity to the contesting respondents, the matter was adjourned for today. Today, nobody appears on behalf of the contesting respondents.

5. As regards the grievance raised by the petitioner about labeling his conduct as a 'blackmailing' tactics, it appears that there is no material on record to arrive at any conclusion to straightway brand the petitioner's conduct as a blackmailing tactics. Even the contentions canvassed on behalf of the petitioner remain uncontroverted. I, therefore, find that the observations about the conduct of the petitioner as a 'blackmailing' tactics is without any basis and needs to be expunged.

6. In view of the above, I find this to be a fit case where indulgence is warranted with the impugned order to the limited extent of expunging the said observation. Hence, the writ petition is allowed and it is directed that the word 'blackmail' from paragraph No.6 of the

impugned judgment and order dated 13.12.2024, passed by Member (Judicial), Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Nagpur, shall be expunged.

7. The writ petition is accordingly disposed of with no order as to costs.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

asd