



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

WRIT PETITION NO.3660/2026

(JOGENDRA RAMESHWAR MOHOD **VERSUS** THE REVENUE DEPARTMENT, THROUGH
 MINISTRY, MANTRALAYA, MUMBAI & OTHERS)

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

Court's or Judge's order

Shri N.A. Gawande, counsel for the petitioner.

Shri A.S. Fulzele, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent nos.1 to 5.

CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATE : MAY 05, 2026

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has challenged the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Minister, Revenue Department by which the petitioner's revision application is rejected.

3. The petitioner, in the capacity of a voter of Gram Panchayat, has initially raised a challenge to the order dated 16.02.2015 passed by the Collector, Amaravati which had granted approval for allotment of land for extension of 'gaothan' to the Gram Panchayat Borgaon Dharmale. The petitioner's appeal filed before the Divisional Commissioner challenging the order dated 16.02.2015 came to be rejected. The revision application filed by the petitioner against the said orders before the Hon'ble Minister also came to be rejected by order dated 21.11.2025. Pertinent to note, by this petition, the petitioner has only challenged the order passed by the Hon'ble Minister and not the orders orders passed by the Collector and the Divisional Commissioner.

4. It has to be noted that on the application submitted by the Member of Panchayat Samiti, Amravati by name Ashish Pundlik Dharmale seeking allotment of land for extension of 'gaathan', the Collector has passed order dated 16.02.2015. While considering the application, the Collector has also considered the objections raised by some of the villagers and has rejected the objection by observing that the houses of about 28 to 30 villagers were affected due to the land acquisition for National Highways and in view of increase of population of the village, there was a need of more land to accommodate them in accordance with the Gharkul Scheme. By recording its pertinent reasons about the need of additional land, the Collector has passed the order in accordance with Sections 20 and 31 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 and directed allotment of 'E' Class land for public utility. Although the petitioner had filed a revision application before the Divisional Commissioner and pursuant thereto the matter was remanded to the Collector which had passed the final order and maintained the earlier order of allotment of land. The petitioner again filed revision application before the Additional Commissioner which came to be rejected by order dated 03.02.2020. The petitioner's further appeal before the Hon'ble Minister also came to be rejected by the impugned order. A perusal of the impugned orders passed by all the Authorities reveals that the allotment of land is upheld by considering the public utility and since the order of allotment was passed by considering the Government policy as reflected in the Government Resolution dated

12.07.2011, none of the Authorities has interfered with the order passed by the Collector.

5. On perusal of the orders passed by all the Authorities, I do not find any perversity warranting interference on any count. It has to be noted that the petitioner claims to be a voter of the Gram Panchayat and has failed to demonstrate any prejudice, much less violation of his rights. Apart from this, the petitioner has failed to challenge the orders passed by the Collector and the Divisional Commissioner and the instant petition raising challenge only to the order passed by the Hon'ble Minister is thus devoid of substance.

6. For the aforesaid reasons, the writ petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)