

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

Office Memoranda of appearance, directions and orders.	Notes, of Court's orders and Registrar's	Office Coram,	Court's or Judge's orders.
--	--	---------------	----------------------------

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16209 OF 2015
IN
CRA (STAMP) NO. 33657 OF 2015

SHIVABAI HARISHCHANDRA PAWAR DIED THROUGH LRS
BANSILAL HARISHCHARNDRA PAWAR @ JAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

...
AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16208 OF 2015
IN
CRA (STAMP) NO. 33661 OF 2015

RAMA SHANKAR JADHAV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

...

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16211 OF 2015
IN
CRA (STAMP) NO. 33663 OF 2015

DATTU RAGHUNATH JADHAV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

...

AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16206 OF 2015
IN CRA (STAMP) NO. 33665 OF 2015

MOHAN BHAGWAN JADHAV
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

...
AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16203 OF 2015
IN CRA (STAMP) NO. 33667 OF 2015

SHAHURAJ HARISCHANDRA PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD AND ANOTHER

...
AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16194 OF 2015
IN CRA (STAMP) NO. 33674 OF 2015

MADHAV PANDHARINATH MORE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD AND ANOTHER

...

AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16197 OF 2015
IN CRA (STAMP) NO. 33676 OF 2015

SUBHASH LAXMAN MORE DIED THROUGH LRS BALAJI
SUBHASH MORE AND OTHERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

...

AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.: 16196 OF 2015
IN CRA (STAMP) NO. 34820 OF 2015

BABURAO S/O SAMBHAJI DHANERAO
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR.COLLECTOR
OSMANABAD

Mr. V. V. Ingale, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mr. V.H.Dighe/ Mr. R.B.Bagul? Mr. D.V.Tele/ Mr. G. O.
Wattamwar/ Mr. S. N. Mahajan, AGP for the Respondent/
State.

CORAM: T. V. NALAWADE, J.
DATED: 17th DECEMBER, 2015.

PER COURT:

1. All these civil applications are filed for condonation of delay. Heard both the sides.
2. In view of the contents of the applications and the submissions made, this Court holds that sufficient ground is made out for condonation of delay. The blame is on the learned counsel. There is no reason for the applicant not to remain present before the Reference Court as applications were filed for enhancement of compensation.
3. In the result, all the applications are allowed. Delay is condoned.

[T.V. NALAWADE, J.]

Dt.17/12/2015
ans/16209