



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1056 PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 58 OF 2024

TULSHIRAM NARAYANRAO DHOND AND OTHERS
VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. B.B. Yenge, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S.K. Tambe, AGP for respondent Nos.1 to 6

Mr. S.S. Dande, Advocate for respondent No.8

Mr. S.V. Dankh, Advocate for applicant in CA/8436/2024

...

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8436 OF 2024 IN PIL/58/2024

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.9654 OF 2024 IN PIL/58/2024

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 26th FEBRUARY, 2026

ORDER :

. Pursuant to our order dated 29.01.2026 learned AGP is producing copy of letter dated 06.02.2026 by Collector, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar to Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue), Mumbai, thereby

sending the proposal for approval of allotment of land admeasuring 124974 sq. mtrs. from CTS No.15309 admeasuring 01 H 16 R situated at Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar for the purpose of establishing Industrial Court and for the residence of Presiding Officer. In view of the same, we take that the order is complied with by Collector, Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar. The said communication is taken on record by marking Exh. 'CH'.

2 In connection with the same, now the response from the Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue) will have to be taken and when he is supposed to take the decision or the Government is supposed to take the decision, taking into consideration the need we direct the said authority to take the decision on the proposal dated 06.02.2026 sent by Collector, Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar within a period of two months from today.

3 As regards the Labour and Industrial Court at Latur is concerned, learned AGP produces bunch of communications. It is taken on record by marking Exh. 'L'. He submits that Collector, Latur has shown positive response for allotting portion from Gat No.83 within Warwanti rural area, however, the said land is now falling within extended jurisdiction of Latur Municipal Corporation. Therefore, valuation report regarding the land is required to be done through Inspector General of Registration and Stamps,

Pune. It would be made available within a period of two weeks and thereafter Collector, Latur would forward the proposal for approval to the State Government within a period of four weeks. We take the said statement as undertaking and direct Collector, Latur to act accordingly.

4 As regards the proposed Labour and Industrial Court, Dhule is concerned, learned AGP is producing on record communication by Collector, Dhule to him dated 25.02.2026. It is taken on record by marking Exh. 'DH'. Here also, Collector, Dhule has agreed to give land out of 37376.83 sq. mtrs area, which according to learned Collector, would be decided as per *bona fide* area requirement assessed by PWD. Learned AGP submits that said requirement would be sought from PWD within two weeks. We harp upon that the requirement of the Labour and Industrial Court as well as the Bar Association is two acres and Collector, Dhule should consider the said demand positively and after getting the necessary certificate from PWD should process the matter further within four weeks thereafter.

5 In view of the said order the Collector, Dhule is also submitting documents about the action taken against the erring officers for misleading the Court. She is submitting the report, wherein it appears that against the Sub Divisional Officer, Dhule, Additional Tahsildar, Dhule (City) the

departmental action is proposed and against Circle Officer, Dhule (City) Mr. Pandit Dawle the punishment has been imposed regarding stoppage of one increment. Now, the learned AGP submits that when again the stop was taken, it has been transpired that as the Police Department was making claim over the said CTS number, subsequently the statement was made. In view of recall of paragraph No.9 of order dated 04.11.2025, wherein the statement was made that the possession of the land would be handed over to Member, Industrial Court within a period of three weeks, the action against the erring officers as directed be dropped. He also submits that as the Police Department was claiming again the documents have been considered, there was no bifurcation of the revenue record which is now got done and, therefore, it is the same land / plot of which the offer was earlier made and, therefore, those revenue officers were found to be now correct.

6 In fact, it appears that there are changes in the statements periodically on behalf of Collector, Dhule and we express our displeasure for the way in which the matter has been handled. When certain statement was supposed to be made before the Court of law, then it ought to have been on the basis of documents and once the statement is made, then it should not be changed. All the exercise to scrutinize the documents should take place before making such statement. Anyway, now the statement is made to which

we hope that Collector would abide regarding allotting two acres of land from CTS No.3512/A/2C, Sheet No.23 at Dhule. We recall the order of directions to Collector, Dhule to take action against the erring officers. We clarify that there is no necessity to take action against Mr. Rohan Kuwar, Sub Divisional Officer, Dhule and Smt. Vaishali Hinge, Additional Tahsildar, Dhule (City). We also direct Collector to set aside the order of stopping one increment of Mr. Pandit Dawle, Circle Officer, Dhule (City). But, at the same time, we give a word of caution that all these officers as well as Collector, Dhule should be cautious enough in future to make a statement before any Court of law.

7 Place the matter for further consideration on 10.04.2026.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)

agd