



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.4703 OF 2026

SATISH
RAMCHANDRA
SANGAR

Shri.Sawkar Narayan Ghode

...Petitioner

V/s.

State of Maharashtra and Ors.

...Respondents

Mr.Sumit V. Khaire, Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr.N.C.Walimbe, Addl.G.P. a/w Ms.Priyanka Chavan, AGP, for all the Respondents-State.

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK &
S. M. MODAK, JJ.

DATE : 15th APRIL 2026

P. C. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner.
2. Learned Addl.G.P. opposed the Petition. It is the grievance of the Petitioner that the Respondents are not justified in not removing the Aakari Pad from 7X12 extract of the Petitioner's land. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that even an application dated 4th November 2025 has been filed for removal of the entry of Aakari Pad. According to learned counsel for the Petitioner, the request of the Petitioner for



removal of entry is as per Section 220 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966 (“**MLR Code, 1966**”). It is submitted that Aakari Pad land can be returned on payment of 25% market value of the said land. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that he is in possession of the said property and cultivating the same for several years.

3. In such view of the matter, the Petitioner has prayed for the following substantial reliefs:-

- a. That this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ or order, award, and/or direction and be pleased to direct the Respondents to decide the application dated 4/11/2025 filed by the Petitioner & passed order of return of land.
- b. That this Hon’ble Court may be pleased to issue an appropriate Writ or order, award, and/or direction and be pleased to direct the Respondents to delete entry of “Aakari Pad @ Sarkari Pad” from the 7/12 extract of the suit property”.

4. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that for the present, he would be satisfied if this Court considers granting relief in terms of prayer clause (a). Since the application dated 4th November 2025 has been before the Respondent No.2, we request the Respondent No.2 – Collector, Pune or the Authority competent to decide the same expeditiously.



5. Learned Addl.G.P. submitted that the records are very old and the necessary action may take some time. In such view of the matter, though we request the Respondent No.2 to decide the application expeditiously, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the application be decided in any event, within outer limit of 6 months from the date of communication of the order in accordance with law.

6. **The Petition is accordingly disposed of.**

(S. M. MODAK, J.)

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)