

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 7070 OF 2026

Evita Krisala Township LLP	...Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	...Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 2415 OF 2026**

Rakesh Popat Bharne	...Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	...Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 2363 OF 2026**

Ravindra Daulat Shitole	...Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	...Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 7071 OF 2026**

Evita Krisala Township LLP	...Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	...Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 7186 OF 2026**

Evita Krisala Township LLP	...Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	...Respondents

**VISHAL
SUBHASH
PAREKAR**

Digitally signed by
VISHAL SUBHASH
PAREKAR
Date: 2026.10.07
18:12:31 +0530

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 7236 OF 2026**

Evita Krisala Township LLP	Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 7187 OF 2026**

Evita Krisala Township LLP	Petitioner
vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Others	Respondents

Mr. Suresh Sabrad a/w. Mr. Amey Sawant, Ms. Neha Zanje, Ms. Eshwaree Kudalkar i/b. Mr. Pratik Sabrad, for the Petitioners.
Mr. Kedar Dighe, Addl.GP for the State in WP No. 7070 of 2026.
Smt. M.S. Bane, AGP for the State in WP Nos. 2415 of 2026 and 2363 of 2026.
Smt. Tanu Bhatia, AGP for the State in WP No. 7071 of 2026.
Smt. P.M.J. Deshpande, AGP in WP No. 7186 of 2026.
Smt. G.R. Raghuwanshi, AGP in WP No. 7236 of 2026.

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

DATE : 7th OCTOBER, 2026

PC.:

1. The petitioners in these petitions are Evita Krisala Township LLP, Rakesh Popat Bharne and Ravindra Daulat Shitole. While five writ petitions have been filed by the said Evita Krisala Township LLP, two writ petitions in this group have been filed by Rakesh Bharne and Ravindra Shitole, each.

2. The petitioners in these petitions have prayed for identical relief of deleting entries pertaining to the Kasarsai Left Canal Project in the revenue records (7/12 extracts) pertaining to the lands that are subject matter of these petitions.

3. In Writ Petition Nos. 7070 of 2026 and 7236 of 2026, as per earlier order passed by this Court, the officers pertaining to the acquiring body or the beneficiary of the acquisition were added as party respondents. Affidavits of service show that the said respondents have been served. The other respondents in these petitions are State authorities who are represented by the learned AGP.

4. It is brought to our notice that reply affidavits have been filed in Writ Petition Nos. 7070 of 2026, 7071 of 2026, 7186 of 2026, 7187 of 2026 and 7236 of 2026.

5. In Writ Petition Nos. 2363 of 2026 and 2415 of 2026, although reply affidavits have not been filed by the State authorities, written instructions have been received from the Deputy Collector, Rehabilitation, Pune to the office of the learned Government Pleader stating that the aforesaid entries in the revenue records pertaining to the said two petitions shall be deleted within a period of 16 weeks.

6. In Writ Petition No. 7071 of 2026, the affidavit of Respondent Nos. 2 and 5 specifically states as follows:

7] I specifically say that Gau No. 232, which is the subject matter of the present writ petition, was not included in the aforesaid notification issued under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. Gat No. 232 also does not find place in the list of Gat numbers reflected in Mutation entry Nos. 1525 and 1600 in connection with the said acquisition proposal.

8] The record further shows that, in relation to Gat No. 232, a remark concerning acquisition for the canal was entered through Mutation entry No. 377, certified on 12.01.1993. The said mutation entry is much prior to the acquisition proposal and the notification referred to in paragraph Nos. 5 and 6 above. Upon verification of the available record, the said remark in respect of Gat No. 232 is not traceable to, nor does it arise from, the notification under Section 4 processed by this office.

7. A perusal of the above-quoted portion of the affidavit-in-reply shows that as per the said respondents, the subject land of the petitioner was not included in the notification for acquisition issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred as "LA Act"), and that Gat No. 232 itself is not reflected in connection with the acquisition proposal. In the light of the aforesaid statement made on behalf of Respondent Nos. 2 to 5, it is evident that the entry in the revenue record pertaining to the Kasarsai Canal Project cannot continue in respect of the subject land. Accordingly, the writ petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).

8. In Writ Petition Nos. 7070 of 2026, 7236 of 2026, 7186 of 2026, and 7187 of 2026, reply affidavits have been filed on behalf of the respondent State authorities, the contents of which are almost identical, and it is specifically stated that beyond issuing notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the LA Act, no further steps were taken in respect of the subject lands. As a representative sample, paragraph 14 of the reply affidavit filed on behalf of Respondent Nos. 2 and 5 in Writ Petition No. 7070 of 2026 is quoted here-in-below:

14] I say that the office of deponent has not taken any steps save and except publication of notification under section 4 and 6. I say that as on date the remark is reflected on the mutation entry of the suit lands.

9. We are of the opinion that in the light of such specific statement on facts made on behalf of the respondent State authorities, it is evident that there is no basis for continuing the entry of Kasarsai Left Canal Project in the revenue record (7/12 extracts) pertaining to the lands that are subject matter of the said writ petitions. Therefore, the said writ petitions are allowed in terms of prayer clauses (a) and (b).

10. As noted hereinabove, in Writ Petition Nos. 2363 of 2026 and 2415 of 2026, the office of the learned Government Pleader has received written instructions from the Deputy Collector,

Rehabilitation, Pune that the entries of the Kasarsai Left Canal Project recorded in the revenue records (7/12 extracts) of the lands pertaining to the said writ petitions shall be deleted within a specific period of time. Hence, the said petitions are also allowed in terms of prayer clause (b) of the said petitions.

11. Although the learned AGP submitted that in the light of the specific instructions received from the Deputy Collector, Rehabilitation, Pune, this Court may consider granting 16 weeks to delete the aforesaid entries in the revenue records pertaining to lands concerned with the present writ petitions as certain procedure as per Government Resolution dated 18.01.2022 is required to be followed, we are of the opinion that in the present case it is not necessary to give such a long period of time for compliance. This is for the reason that the procedure contemplated in the Government Resolution is necessary for ensuring that the affected party should be put to notice. In this case, the entries pertained to the State authorities themselves in respect of acquisitions that never fructified. Therefore, the action to be undertaken by the respondent State authorities is merely a correction of the record in the light of the stated stand taken before this Court.

12. In view of the above, the writ petitions are allowed in the above terms, and consequential steps shall be taken by the respondent State authorities for deleting the aforesaid entries in the revenue records pertaining to the lands concerning the present writ petitions within a period of six weeks from today.

13. The petitions stand disposed of.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)