

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 1995 OF 2026**

Vijay Janardhan Patil ...Petitioner  
Versus  
State Of Maharashtra & Ors ...Respondents

Adv. Sandeep Raman a/w. Adv. Rangan Majumdar for the Petitioner.  
Smt. M. S. Bane, AGP for the Respondent Nos. 1 to 4

**CORAM: MANISH PITALE &  
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.**

**DATE: 18<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2026**

**P.C.**

1. Heard learned Counsel for the Petitioner.
2. The Petitioner claims that he is totally unaware as to whether any acquisition proceeding had been undertaken with respect to the land in question. He claims that the land belonged to his grandfather.
3. By referring to an entry in the revenue record (7/12 extract) recording that the land was acquired as per L.A.Q.C. 336 dated 03/02/1970, the Petitioner claims that he was prompted to approach the Respondent-authorities seeking information and documents with regard to acquisition of the land. According to him, none of the Respondents could provide any documents and therefore, he is entitled to approach this Court

in writ jurisdiction to call upon the Respondents to produce the complete records and proceedings of the acquisition. Thereupon, the Petitioner claims a declaration that the acquisition proceedings be declared illegal and void.

4. We find that raking up of such issues pertaining to acquisitions having taken place decades ago is leading to series of Writ Petitions being filed before this court.

5. It is not clear as to on what basis the Petitioner claims that compensation was not paid. Such Petitions also put pressure on the Respondent-authorities to fetch documents which are decades old, in order to defend their position. There is nothing available on record in the Writ Petition to make a positive assertion that compensation was never paid. We are not sure as to whether the grandfather of the Petitioner had actually picked up the compensation.

6. It would have been a complete answer to the issues sought to be raised by the Petitioner, more than 50 years after the acquisition process, only if the authorities had provided a copy of the land acquisition award to the Petitioner.

7. Be that as it may, issue notice to the Respondents, returnable on 30/03/2026.

8. Learned AGP waives notice on behalf of Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.
9. The Petitioner is additionally permitted to serve the Respondent No. 5-CIDCO by way of private service and to file an affidavit of service before the next date of hearing.
10. We make it clear that if the Respondent-authorities produce records and demonstrate that the acquisition had been undertaken in accordance with law and compensation had been disbursed to the predecessor of the Petitioner, we will impose heavy costs on the Petitioner.

**(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)**

**(MANISH PITALE, J.)**