
(2011) 03 BOM CK 0125

In the Bombay High Court

Case No : Writ Petition No. 2258 of 1992

Sidram Solunke, deceased through his L.Rs. (Dnyaneshwar @ Nanasaheb Solunke and Digamber Solunke) **APPELLANT**

Vs

The State of Maharashtra and The Additional Commissioner, Aurangabad Division **RESPONDENT**

Date of Decision : 07-03-2011

Acts Referred:

Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961 — Section 12, 21, 45(2)

Citation : (2011) 03 BOM CK 0125

Hon'ble Judges : S.S. Shinde, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : E.P. Sawant, for the Appellant; P.P. More, A.G.P., for the Respondent

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

S.S. Shinde, J.—This petition takes exception to the notice issued by the Additional Commissioner, Aurangabad Division, Aurangabad bearing No. 1978/ICHR/287 dated 27.04.1992 and notice dated 01.06.1992.

2. The Petitioners are resident of village Hingni (Khurd), Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed. The Petitioners are legal heir and successor of the deceased Sidram Ganpatrao Solunke. The Petitioners are original land holders in the proceeding under the subject matter. It is the case of the Petitioners that, they have filed return u/s 12 of the Maharashtra Agricultural Land (Ceiling on Holdings) Act 1961 along with their father namely Sidram Ganpatrao Solunke, now who is no more. Thereafter, the S.L.D.T., Majalgaon in File No. 75/ICHR/961 vide the judgment and order dated 27.04.1976 had declared the Petitioners as the surplus land holders to the extent of 47 Acres and 36 gunthas along with the father. The land which is declared as surplus to the extent of 47 Acres and 36 Gunthas of Majalgaon is given in possession to who said has been allotted by the competent authority.

3. It is the further case of the Petitioners that, the Additional Commissioner/ Respondent No. 2 by exercising powers u/s 45(2) of the Ceiling Act reopened the enquiry i.e. initiated a suo moto proceeding by issuing notice in the year 1992. The Petitioner submitted that, the Respondent No. 2 has no jurisdiction or powers to start or reopen the suo moto enquiry u/s 45(2) of the Ceiling Act after the period of 3 years from the date of judgment and order passed by the S.L.D.T. The Additional Commissioner must apply his mind within a period of 3 years by summoning the land holder and to start the enquiry. The commissioner must complete the enquiry within a period of 3 years from the date of the order passed by the S.L.D.T. It is further submitted that, in the present case, the Additional Commissioner has not called the record of the S.L.D.T. within a period of 3 years. The Additional Commissioner has issued the notice of suo moto enquiry for the first time after 16 years i.e. on 27.04.1992 and immediately another notice on 01.06.1992. The Petitioners/land holders have never received any kind of notice or intimation by the Respondent No. 2. Therefore, the counsel for the Petitioners submitted that, this writ petition may be allowed and notices dated 27.04.1992 and 01.06.1992 may be quashed and set aside.

4. On the other hand the learned Additional Government Pleader vehemently opposed the petition and submitted that, the notices are rightly issued by the Additional Commissioner, Aurangabad u/s 45(2) of the said Act. Therefore, this writ petition is devoid of any merits and same may be dismissed.

5. I have given due consideration to the rival submissions of the learned Counsel for the parties. It is admitted position that the S.L.D.T. Majalgaon passed the order on 27.04.1976 whereby father of the Petitioners and Petitioners were declared as surplus land holders. The excess land also been given in possession of whom the same is allotted by the competent authorities. It is also admitted position that the notices were issued by the Additional Commissioner on 27.04.1992 and 01.06.1992. Therefore, said notices for suo moto enquiry were after the period of about 16 years from the date of order passed by the S.L.D.T., Majalgaon. There also appears to be non application of mind on the part of the Additional Commissioner. It further appears that, documents and facts of the case are not properly seen by the Additional Commissioner before issuing notices for suo moto enquiry. Therefore, in my opinion, since the notices issued by the Additional Commissioner on 27.04.1992 and 01.06.1992 were beyond the statutory period prescribed u/s 45(2) of the Ceiling Act, the said notices deserves to be quashed and set aside.

6. This Court had occasion to interpret provisions of Section 45(2) of the Said Act in following decisions:

In the case of Manohar Ramchandra Manapure and Ors. v. State of Maharashtra and Anr. 1989 Mh.L.J. 1011, the Full Bench of this Court held that the proviso to section 45(2) of the Maharashtra Agriculture Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, restricts the exercise of jurisdiction u/s 45(2) to those cases where the record is called for within the period of 3 years from the date of declaration u/s 21. The

starting point of limitation as prescribed in the proviso to subsection (2) of Section 45 is the declaration or part thereof u/s 21 of the Act. Calling of the record cannot be equated with the mechanical, clerical or ministerial act of calling for the record for all the proceedings irrespective of the fact whether they were required or not for the purpose specified in the section. It is further held that it is after applying his mind that the revisional authority will have to call for the record of the enquiry or proceedings after conscious application of mind to the facts and circumstances of each case. Where admittedly the necessary application of mind on the part of the Commissioner was much beyond the period of 3 years of the order impugned, it will have to be held that the records were not called within the period of 3 years. In such a case the Commissioner will have no power to exercise the revisional jurisdiction.

Yet in another decision in the case of *Bansilal Ramgopal Bhattad v. State of Maharashtra and Ors.* 2001 (1) Mh.L.J. 68, this Court held that suo motu proceedings for revision having been initiated almost after 9 years from the date of decision of S.L.D.T., could not be permitted in law. Suo motu proceedings in question having been initiated after unreasonable period were without authority of law and void ab initio in view of the decision of the Apex Court in *Mohamad Kavi Mohamad Amin Vs. Fatmabai Ibrahim*, .

Yet in another reported case of *Lotan Fakira Patil v. State of Maharashtra and Ors.* 2002 (2) Mh.L.J. 255, this Court in the facts of the case held, notice u/s 45(2) of the Act for suo moto revision was issued on 25.03.1982 and not within the period of three years from the date of order of S.L.D.T. dated 03.07.1978 and therefore the exercise of powers under the said provisions was beyond the period of limitation and therefore was without jurisdiction.

Yet in another case of *Champabai Patwari and Another Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others*, , this Court held that the first proviso to subsection (2) of section 45 of the Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) Act, 1961 lays down two conditions which are required to be satisfied before the State Government or its delegate could invoke the revisional powers. The said two conditions are: (a) that, appeal has not been filed against the order/declaration made by S.L.D.T. within the prescribed period, and (b) that, a period of 3 years has not elapsed from the date of the order or declaration made by S.L.D.T. In the facts of that case the Court held that the decision to initiate the proceedings was taken within three years time. However, same was without application of mind and hence held to be bad in law. It is further held that the actual initiation of proceedings was after a lapse of about 8 to 10 years from the date of decision to initiate the proceedings. This delay was totally unexplained. Therefore, taking overall view of the matter, the Court held that where the notice came to be issued to the Petitioner by the Additional Commissioner, after lapse of period of 8-10 years, after passing orders by S.L.D.T., holding that the Petitioners did not hold land in excess of ceiling limit are bad in law.

Yet in another case of *Shalikram Dagduba Solunke etc. v. State of Maharashtra*

and Anr. 2004 (1) Mh.L.R. 310, this Court held that exercise of revisional powers by Additional Commissioner after 10 to 15 years from the date of order of S.L.D.T., is beyond the statutory period and also passed in mechanical manner and same is liable to be set aside.

Yet in another judgment in Gowardhandas deceased through his L.R. Vijaykumar Vs. The State of Maharashtra and The Additional Divisional Commissioner, , this Court held that in suo-motu revision by Additional Commissioner, memorandum regarding revision issued on 30.11.1978 after declaration u/s 21 on 08.11.1976 but no notice was issued to the Petitioner till 1992, the order passed by the Additional Commissioner on 30.03.1993 is beyond limitation prescribed u/s 45(2) of the said Act.

7. Therefore, in the light of aforesaid discussion the notices dated 27.04.1992 and 01.06.1992 issued by the Additional Commissioner, Aurangabad Division, Aurangabad bearing No. 1978/ICHR/287 are quashed and set aside. The petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause "C". Rule is made absolute in above terms. The writ petition stands disposed of.