IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

1

CIVIL APPEAL NO. /2025 [@ SLP [C] NO.17134/2024]

GROUP GRAMPANCHAYAT PANDANE

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

BHASKAR RAMKRISHNA KOND (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

ORDER

Leave granted.

The High Court, vide the impugned judgment, has set aside the order of the Hon'ble Revenue Minister (hereinafter referred to as "the Minister') dated 18.09.2019 only to the extent of the quashing of the order of regularization passed by the Collector, dated 05.06.2014. As a consequence, the order of regularisation and mutation entries in favour of the private respondents have been restored.

The present appeal has been filed by the appellant-Gram Panchayat, inter alia, contending that the ultimate conclusion arrived at by the High Court in the impugned judgment cannot be sustained in the eye of law. The said contention is made by placing reliance upon not only the earlier order passed by the High Court dated 30.07.2018, whereby the two orders passed by the Minister were set

aside, but also the subsequent decision of the Minister in favour of the appellant.

2

Learned counsel appearing for the private respondent(s) submitted that the of regularization dated 05.06.2014 is an independent order passed by the Collector. However, learned counsel appearing for the State, while concurring stand taken by the learned with the appearing for the appellant, submitted that, only in pursuance of the order passed by the Minister in favour of the private respondents in the year 2014, the consequential order of regularization has been passed by the Collector.

We are of the considered view that the view of the High Court in the impugned judgment, cannot be sustained in the eye of law as the order regularisation passed by the Collector is nothing but a consequential decision made in pursuance of the order passed by the Minister in favour of the private respondents in 2014, which has already been aside by the High Court in set previous proceeding, vide order dated 30.07.2018. That is the reason why the private respondents chose to continue to pursue the proceedings before the Minister.

Accordingly, the impugned judgment stands set aside. Consequently, we are inclined to hold that the order of regularisation passed by the Collector,

3

being consequential to the earlier order which has been set aside by the High Court, therefore, becomes merged with the subsequent order passed by the Minister, and thus, the appeal deserves to be allowed.

Accordingly, the order of the Collector, being consequential, stands set aside and the appeal stands allowed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

 	SUNDRESH

[RAJESH BINDAL]

NEW DELHI; MAY 19, 2025.

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA **RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 17134/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-06-2024 in WP No. 11732/2019 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Bombay 1

GROUP GRAMPANCHAYAT PANDANE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BHASKAR RAMKRISHNA KOND (DECEASED) THROUGH LRS. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Date: 19-05-2025 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BINDAL

Mr. Sandeep Sudhakar Deshmukh, AOR For Petitioner(s)

Mr. Nishant Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Ankur S. Savadikar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Anand Dilip Landge, AOR

Mrs. Sangeeta S Pahune Patil, Adv.

Ms. Revati P. Kharde, Adv.

Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Aniruddha Deshmukh, Adv.

Mr. Siddharth Dharmadhikari, Adv.

Mr. Aaditya Aniruddha Pande, AOR

Ms. Deeplaxmi Subhash Matwankar, AOR

Mr. Ashok Gade, Adv.

Ms. Manreet Kaur, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following ORDER

Leave granted.

The appeal stands allowed in terms of the signed order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(ASHA SUNDRIYAL) **DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

(POONAM VAID) **ASSISTANT REGISTRAR**

[Signed order is placed on the file]