



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

Writ Petition No.6220/2025
Naresh and others V SDO Yavatmal and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders of directions
 and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. M.M. Agnihotri, Advocate for petitioners.
 Mr. J.B. Jaiswal, Advocate for resp. no.2, 3 and 9.
 Mr. Sundaram, Advocate for reps. nos.4 to 8.
 Ms Anjali Agrawal, Advocate for resp. nos.15 to 19.
 Mr. C.S. Dhore, Advocate for resp. Nos. 10 to 14.
 Mr. Joshi, AGP for resp. no.1.
 Mr. Deshpande, Advocate for Caveator.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.
DATE : 13-01-2026.

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners as well as learned
 Counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has challenged order dated 15-09-2025
 passed by respondent no.1/Sub-Divisional Officer, Yavatmal, rejecting the
 application for production of two documents.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the
 petitioners have initiated proceedings under Section 107 of the
 Maharashtra Tenancy and Agricultural Lands (Vidarbha Region) Act,
 1958, seeking quashment of order passed by the tenancy Tahsildar dated
 18-03-2025. In the proceedings the respondents have appeared and they
 have filed preliminary objection to the maintainability of the application.
 It is pointed out that the petitioners/applicants in the said proceedings
 tried to file on record two documents both dated 18-09-1965 which are in
 the nature of orders passed by the President, Lands Tribunal/Additional
 Tahsildar, Yavatmal about dropping of the tenancy proceedings with
 respect to the suit property. It is pointed out that these two documents are

relevant for deciding the controversy involved before the respondent no.1 and the petitioners/applicants ought to have been allowed to place the documents on record.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents fairly submit that the production of two documents could be allowed, however, the contentions with respect to the said two documents could be made subject matter of adjudication before the authority.

5. Having regard to this limited controversy, the petition needs to be disposed of by directing the respondent no.1 to allow the petitioners/applicants to place on record the two documents both dated 18-09-1965. After the documents are produced, the respondents are entitled to make their respective submissions with respect to the said documents. In view of this, writ petition is disposed of.

6. Having regard to the fact that the parties are litigating since 1976 and the parties are of advanced age, the respondent no.1 is directed to expeditiously decide the proceedings and preferably within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

(Prafulla S. Khubalkar, J.)