

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD**R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2713 of 2026**

=====

MANHARBHAI CHIMANBHAI PATEL & ANR.

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT & ORS.

=====

Appearance:

MR MEET D KAKADIA(11896) for the Petitioner(s) No. 1,2

MR N S PARMAR(6785) for the Petitioner(s) No. 1,2

GOVERNMENT PLEADER for the Respondent(s) No. 1,2,3,4

=====

CORAM:HONOURABLE MS. JUSTICE VAIBHAVI D. NANAVATI**Date : 27/02/2026****ORAL ORDER**

1. Heard Mr. S.P. Majmudar, learned advocate appearing with Mr. Meet D. Kakadia, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners.

2. By way of present petition, the petitioners herein have challenged the impugned order passed by the Collector, Vadodara, in RTS/Suo Motu Revision Case No.6/2025, dated 03.01.2026 pursuant to the show cause notice issued on 24.07.2025. The petitioners were issued show cause notice upon an objection/complaint filed by a third party; having no right, title or interest in the property that, the orders passed by the learned Mamlatdar, Savli, in Jamin/Vashi/833/2018, dated

12.06.2018 and the Prant Officer, Savli, in RTS/Delay/Appeal No.71/2023 dated 28.06.2023 whereby, by the said orders, the words “Administrator of the land of Surajba Charity Hospital” were directed to be removed from the revenue record wherein, the same was mutated in the revenue record as entry No.3978, upon the petitioners’ application for rectification.

3. Mr. Majmudar, learned advocate submits that the order passed by the learned Collector is beyond the show cause notice wherein, while interfering with the orders impugned passed by the Mamlatdar and the Deputy Collector, as referred to herein above, the petitioners’ heirship entries mutated in the revenue record as back as on 09.01.1973 by way of revenue entry No.3282 also stands cancelled. It is submitted that the impugned order is beyond jurisdiction wherein, by the impugned order, the petitioners heirship entries are cancelled wherein, the land-in-question is purchased by way of a registered sale deed by the petitioners’ father and the said sale deed is duly produced on record at Annexure – C, page 48 (51/A) to the petition, dated 10.05.1948. It is submitted that even otherwise, the impugned order by setting aside the entry dated 09.01.1973 being Entry No.3282, is such that the same

is contrary to the settled principles of law that, such order could not have been passed upon a lapse of more than 52 years. The aforesaid adversely affects the rights of the petitioners.

4. The submissions made by Mr. Majmudar, learned advocate appearing for petitioners, prima facie, require consideration.

5. Issue **Notice** making it returnable on **30.03.2026**. Mr. Angesh A. Panchal, learned AGP waives service of notice for and on behalf of the respondent No.1.

In the interregnum period, interim relief in terms of paragraph 27(B), as prayed for, is granted. Over and above the interim relief, the parties to maintain status quo, till the next returnable date.

Direct service qua rest of the respondents is permitted.

(VAIBHAVI D. NANAVATI,J)

NEHA