

MHSO050016372024 ORDER BELOW EXH.1 IN REVIEW APPLICATION



No.01/2024

Samarth Vs. Collector

1 Present application is filed to revive the order passed by this Court on 05.09.2024 in Civil Misc. Application No.103/2024.

2 Learned advocate for the applicant submitted that the applicant is owner of Gat No.277/1/B area 47 R and Gat No.277/2/B area 40 R situation at Mouje Radde. Mother of applicant purchased land Gat No.276/1/A area 1 H 7 R + pk 7 R for consideration of Rs.6,90,000/-. Therefore, they have demanded loan as they are in need of money. Therefore, they decided to sell suit property for consideration of Rs.4,75,000/-. As the property is owned by the minor applicant, they filed above application but this Court dismissed the application on the ground that the document were not filed. No reason is proved for selling the land. Therefore, this review petition is filed. In this review petition, this applicant filed copy of sale-deed by which it is proved that mother of the applicant purchased land Gat No.276/1A at village Radde. Also this applicant filed an agreement executed between the applicant and Ayappa Aabaji Saptale. The applicant also filed affidavit of the parents. Therefore, permission may be granted by the Review order passed by this Court in Civil Misc. Application No.103/2024.

3 On perusal of order passed by this Court in Civil Misc. Application No.103/2024, it shows that this Court (Shri. D. N. Survase, District Judge – 1, Pandharpur) refused to grant permission on the ground that no document were filed about an agreement in respect of suit property. Also there is no document to show that this applicant was having loan.

4 On perusal of document filed by the applicant, it finds that mother of the applicant i.e. Dipali purchased land Gat No.276/1/A at village Mouje Radde but said document is not sufficient to come to the conclusion that another

land purchased in the name of applicant. Also by selling property of minor his parents wanted to purchase the property in the name of mother. It shows that sale is not for the benefit of minor. While granting permission to sell property of minor, prime consideration that said sale-should be for benefit of minor. But prima facie, there is no material to come to the conclusion that said sale is for benefit of minor. Also there is no document to prove that loan was taken in the name of minor for their benefit. Therefore, the application is not entitled to be allowed. Hence, following order.

**ORDER**

Review application is dismissed.

Date :27.03.2026

(O. R. Deshmukh)  
District Judge - 1, Pandharpur

## CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Judgment/Order are same word to word as per the original Judgment/Order.

- a) Name of the Stenographer : S. A. B. Shaikh, Steno Grade - I
- b) Court : District Judge – 1, Pandharpur
- c) Date of Order : 27.03.2026
- d) Order signed by the : 01.04.2026  
Presiding Officer on
- e) Order uploaded on : 02.04.2026