

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5853 OF 2026**

Chaya Dattu Gunjal ... Petitioner  
vs.  
The Sub-divisional Officer, Nashik and others ... Respondents

**WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5954 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5971 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5997 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5976 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5962 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 6005 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5984 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5977 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5999 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5985 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 6006 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5974 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5978 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5989 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO. 11296 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5993 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5996 OF 2026  
WITH  
WRIT PETITION NO. 5987 OF 2026**

Mr. Rameshwar N. Gite for petitioners in all petitions.

Mr. B. V. Samant, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. P. M. J. Deshpande, AGP for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 – State in WP/5853/2026, WP/5954/2026, WP/5971/2026, WP/5997/2026 and WP/5996/2026.

Ms. Tanu N. Bhatia, AGP for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 – State in WP/5976/2026, WP/5962/2026, WP/6005/2026 and WP/5984/2026.

Ms. G. R. Raghuvanshi, AGP for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 – State in WP/5977/2026, WP/5999/2026, WP/5985/2026 and WP/6006/2026.

Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 – State in WP/5974/2026, WP/5978/2026, WP/5989/2026, WP(St)/11296/2026, WP/5993/2026 and WP/5987/2026.

Mr. Atul Damle, Senior Advocate, a/w. Ms. Iraa Dube Patil, i/b. Jay & Co. for respondent No.3 – MIDC in all petitions.

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

**DATE : 05<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2026**

**P.C. :**

- . Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.
2. By these petitions, the petitioners have challenged orders dated 22.02.2026 passed by the respondent No.1 – Sub-divisional Officer (SDO), Nashik, whereby the objections raised on behalf of the petitioners have been rejected. These petitions are filed in the backdrop of a common order dated 01.10.2025 passed in Writ Petition No.7644 of 2024 and connected petitions, by a Division Bench of this Court (Coram: G. S. Kulkarni & Aarti Sathe, JJ), whereby the grievances raised on behalf of the petitioners and others, in the context of Section 32(2) of the Maharashtra Industrial Development Act, 1961 (MID Act), were considered. The Division Bench of this Court found that the procedure contemplated under the said provision was not properly followed and a *fait accompli* was sought to be forced upon the petitioners and other land owners in the context of acquisition of land for formation of an industrial estate.

3. In the said order, the Division Bench of this Court, after making observations about the procedure not being properly followed by the State authorities, issued the following directions:

**‘ORDER**

- (i) The procedure as set into motion to acquire the land of the petitioner under sub-section (2) of Section 32 shall be strictly carried out in accordance with law, that is on consideration of the objections of the petitioners as also of the respective Gram Sabha's and Panchayat Samiti's and after granting an opportunity of hearing all the concerned, such objections shall be first decided, before taking any decision on the acquisition of the land. It is only after such reasoned decision is made known to the petitioners, the Gram Sabha's and Panchayat Samiti, further steps be taken under Section 32 of the MID Act.
- (ii) Status quo as on date in regard to the possession as also the mutation entries shall be maintained till the final appropriate decision in the manner known to law is taken.
- (iii) All contentions of the parties on the acquisition proceedings are expressly kept open.’

4. It is the case of the petitioners that despite specific directions issued by this Court in the above-quoted portion of the order, respondent No.1 – SDO has passed brief orders, rejecting the objections raised by the petitioners, without discussing in detail the grievances raised by them. The directions contained in the operative portion of the said order of this Court are not complied with, in letter and spirit.

5. It is also alleged that proper personal hearing was not given and all the petitioners were herded together in a room and thereupon, the impugned orders were passed.

6. Issue notice, returnable on 16.06.2026, High on Board. The learned AGP waives notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1, 2 and 4 in all petitions. Ms. Patil, learned counsel waives notice on behalf of respondent No.3 – MIDC.

7. Although the learned AGP and the learned senior counsel appearing for respondent No.3 are opposing grant of any ad-interim relief, we are inclined to do so till the next date of listing, for the reason that bare perusal of the impugned orders shows that respondent No.1 – SDO has *prima facie* failed to discuss in detail the grievances raised by the petitioners. There is no reference to the specific directions issued by this Court in the aforesaid order dated 01.10.2025. In the said order, this Court had directed that the objections of respective Gram Sabhas and Panchayat Samitis should also be taken into account. The impugned orders do not show any reference to the same and therefore, a *prima facie* case is made out on behalf of the petitioners to allege that the directions specifically issued by this Court, have not been complied with.

8. The above-quoted portion of the said order also shows that this Court had directed to maintain *status quo* as regards possession and also mutation entries, till the final decision of respondent No.1 – SDO. We are inclined to continue the direction of *status quo*, as an ad-interim measure.

9. In view of the above, till the next date of listing, *status quo* shall be maintained as regards possession as also mutation entries.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)