

Revenue authorities acting under Sections 149 and 150 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966, are not vested with the jurisdiction to adjudicate complex questions of title, the validity of testamentary succession, or the enforceability of civil court decrees, as these matters fall exclusively within the domain of competent civil courts

The **Bombay High Court** in the case of **Meena A. Rizvi vs State of Maharashtra [Writ Petition No. 1365 of 2012]** dated **February 04, 2026**, has held that the power of revenue authorities under Sections 149 and 150 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966, is strictly limited to updating revenue records for fiscal and administrative purposes based on the acquisition of rights. These authorities are not empowered to adjudicate upon the title or substantive rights of the parties to immovable properties, as this jurisdiction is vested exclusively in the civil courts.

Consequently, the Court held that when a claim for mutation is founded upon a registered Consent Decree passed by a competent civil court, which has attained finality, the revenue authorities are duty-bound to give effect to it for the limited purpose of mutation. The Court said that Revenue Authorities cannot sit in appeal over the decree, question its legality, re-examine the underlying transaction, or refuse to act upon it by delving into issues such as testamentary succession, the authority of vendors, or the validity of the decree's registration, as these are matters beyond their statutory competence.

The Court therefore quashed all three impugned orders, and directed that Mutation Entry No. 2248 in the Property Register Card for the subject property in favour of the Petitioner shall be restored. It clarified that this restoration is purely for fiscal and administrative purposes and does not confer, declare, or extinguish title, nor does it prejudice the right of any party to seek appropriate relief before a competent civil court. The City Survey Officer, was also directed to implement this order by making the necessary entries within four weeks.

The Court observed that the legal position governing mutation entries in revenue records is well-settled; they are maintained primarily for fiscal and administrative purposes and do not, by themselves, create, confer, or extinguish title to the property. The Court clarified that revenue authorities acting under Sections 149 and 150 of the Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, 1966, are not vested with the jurisdiction to adjudicate complex questions of title, the validity of testamentary succession, or the enforceability of civil court decrees, as these matters fall exclusively within the domain of competent civil courts.

The Court pointed out that the revenue authorities had travelled far beyond their limited jurisdiction by entering into an elaborate examination of the Petitioner's title, the authority of her vendors, the effect of prohibitory orders, and the legality of the registration of the Consent Decree, which the Court deemed an impermissible exercise amounting to sitting in appeal over a judicial decree.

The Court also observed that Respondent No. 5's claim to be a 'person interested' was insufficient, as a bare assertion of a right without any cogent documentary evidence, such as

a registered lease deed, cannot be used to obstruct mutation proceedings founded on a registered court decree.