

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

36 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6989 OF 2015
IN FAST/17186/2015 WITH CA/6990/2015 IN FAST/17186/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DIST. AURANGABAD AN

VERSUS

SATISH HARICHANDRA JAGTAP AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicant : M.S. Deshpande h/f. Pawar D.B.

...

37 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6991 OF 2015
IN FAST/17183/2015 WITH CA/6992/2015 IN FAST/17183/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DIST. AURANGABAD AN

VERSUS

SAHEBRAO SHANKAR JAGTAP AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicant : M.S. Deshpande h/f. Pawar D.B.

...

38 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6993 OF 2015
IN FAST/17177/2015 WITH CA/6994/2015 IN FAST/17177/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DIST. AURANGABAD AND ANOTHER

VERSUS

GANGADHAR ONKAR AUTADE AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Applicant : M.S. Deshpande h/f. Pawar D.B.

...

39 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6995 OF 2015
IN FAST/17174/2015 WITH CA/6997/2015 IN FAST/17174/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DIST. AURANGABAD AN

VERSUS

RAJENDRA JAGNNATH JAGTAP DIED THR HIS LRS SAVITA
RAJENDRA JAGTAP AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Applicant : M.S. Deshpande h/f. Pawar D.B.

...

40 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6998 OF 2015
IN FAST/17180/2015 WITH CA/6999/2015 IN FAST/17180/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, IRRIGATION DEPARTMENT, ZILLA
PARISHAD, DIST. AURANGABAD AN
VERSUS
SHIVAJI NIVRUTI JAGTAP

...

Advocate for Applicant : M.S. Deshpande h/f. Pawar D.B.

...

CORAM : T.V. NALAWADE, J.

DATED : 22nd February, 2016.

PER COURT :

1. In delay condonation applications, heard the learned counsel for applicant, Acquiring Body. The respondents are duly served, but they have not turned up. The learned AGP is for the State, but he is on the side of Acquiring Body. The delay of around 752 days is caused in filing the appeals. It is contended that time was taken for getting certified copy and then processing the matters. In view of the contents of the applications and submissions made, this Court holds that sufficient cause is shown. Nothing could have been achieved by not filing the appeal in time. Applications filed for delay condonation are allowed. Delay is condoned.

2. Appeals are **admitted**. Notice after admission is

made returnable on 12.7.2016. Call record and proceedings.

3. On stay applications, heard the learned counsel for Acquiring Body. Seen the judgments and awards of Reference Court. In view of the contents of the judgment, this Court holds that stay can be granted subject to condition of deposit of entire amount of compensation. Stay applications are allowed. Stay is granted subject to condition of depositing entire amount of compensation within ten weeks from today. If the amount is not deposited within this period, it is to be presumed that there is no stay to the execution. Stay applications are disposed of.

[T.V. NALAWADE, J.]

ssc/