

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.751 OF 2018

Maneesh Bawa And 2 Ors. ...Petitioners

vs

Gaurishankar Musafirsingh And 6 Ors. ...Respondents

.....

Ms. Rajani Iyer, Senior Counsel a/w. Mr. J.S. Kini, and Ms. Sapna Krishnappa, i/b. Suresh Dubey, for the Petitioners.

Mr. Chetan Kapadia, a/w. Mr. Karl Tamboly, Ms. Swapna Roopavate and Devul Dighe, i/b. Tushar Goradia, for Respondent No.1.

Mr. Rajiv Mane, AGP, for Respondent Nos. 2 and 4.

.....

CORAM : S.C. GUPTE, J.

DATED: 4 APRIL 2019

P.C.:

. Heard learned Counsel for the parties. Rule.

2. Prima facie, the impugned order of the Hon'ble Minister passed in revision under Section 257 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code indicates an infirmity. It appears from the order that the entries in the revenue records made in favour of the Petitioners, first, by District Superintendent Land Records, Mumbai Suburban, and confirmed by Deputy Director of Land Records, Konkan Region, are set aside by Hon'ble Minister in revision merely on the ground that the Petitioners came before these authorities after a long delay. The other reasons cited by the Hon'ble Minister do not indicate how the Minister considered the

merits of the controversy. In particular, the order does not indicate how Respondent No.1 was entitled to have his name entered in the revenue records in respect of the subject property, which entry appears to have been corrected by the authorities below in favour of the Petitioners. In the premises, pending hearing and final disposal of the petition, all parties shall maintain status-quo as regards the revenue entry concerning the subject property, namely, CTS No.1250/2, as of today. At the request of Respondent No.1, the hearing of the petition is expedited.

(S.C. GUPTE, J.)