



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

WRIT PETITION NO.6906 OF 2025

Nitin S/O Mahadev Sawale, Thr. P.O.A., Mahadeo Laxmansa Sawale
Vs.

The Additional Commissioner, Amravati Division, Amravati 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. Ram Karode, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. K.H. Bhondge, AGP for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3/State.

Mr. J.B. Thakare h/f. Mr. A.P. Tathod, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

CORAM: PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATED : 26th MARCH, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsel for the respondents.

2. By this petition, the petitioner has challenged the interim order dated 30.10.2025 passed by the respondent No.1 by which the application for interim stay to the order passed by the Additional Collector, Akola came to be rejected. Although the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned counsels for the respondents have advanced their submissions on certain aspects which are touching merits of the matter, it is seen that the controversy revolves around the issue about validity of transfer of land and status of transferer as tribal person. Having regard to the issues involved and contentions canvassed, instead of recording any finding at this stage, it is desirable that the revision application pending before the respondent No.1- Additional Commissioner, Amravati, be decided on merits.

3. It is pointed out that the parties are contesting the revision application on merits and therefore, instead of entertaining the challenge in the instant petition, the main revision application need to be directed to be decided.

4. It has to be noted that the petitioner has asserted that he is in long standing possession of the property which is protected by an Order dated 13.11.2025 passed by this Court in this petition and further, the fact of petitioner's possession is also not disputed by the respondent No.4 – Tulshiram Premdev Solanke.

5. In view of this, Respondent No.1 – Additional Commissioner, Amravati is directed to decide the revision application expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months from today.

6. In view of above, during the pendency of the revision application, the petitioner's possession may not be disturbed and accordingly, the writ petition is **disposed of** with no order as to costs.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

Privel