

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

993 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.10556 OF 2016
IN FAST/19941/2016

WITH

CA/10557/2016 IN FAST/19941/2016 WITH CA/10558/2016
IN FAST/19941/2016 WITH CA/10559/2016 IN

FAST/20004/2016 WITH CA/10560/2016 IN
FAST/20004/2016 WITH CA/10561/2016 IN
FAST/20004/2016 WITH CA/10563/2016 IN
FAST/19982/2016 WITH CA/10564/2016 IN
FAST/19982/2016 WITH CA/10566/2016 IN
FAST/19982/2016 WITH CA/10567/2016 IN
FAST/19973/2016 WITH CA/10568/2016 IN
FAST/19973/2016 WITH CA/10569/2016 IN
FAST/19973/2016 WITH CA/10570/2016 IN
FAST/20024/2016 WITH CA/10571/2016 IN
FAST/20024/2016 WITH CA/10572/2016 IN
FAST/20024/2016 WITH CA/10573/2016 IN
FAST/20011/2016 WITH CA/10574/2016 IN
FAST/20011/2016 WITH CA/10575/2016 IN
FAST/20011/2016 WITH CA/10576/2016 IN
FAST/20017/2016 WITH CA/10577/2016 IN
FAST/20017/2016 WITH CA/10578/2016 IN
FAST/20017/2016 WITH CA/10579/2016 IN
FAST/19987/2016 WITH CA/10580/2016 IN
FAST/19987/2016 WITH CA/10581/2016 IN
FAST/19987/2016 WITH CA/10582/2016 IN
FAST/19993/2016 WITH CA/10583/2016 IN
FAST/19993/2016 WITH CA/10584/2016 IN
FAST/19993/2016 WITH CA/10586/2016 IN
FAST/19978/2016 WITH CA/10587/2016 IN
FAST/19978/2016 WITH CA/10588/2016 IN
FAST/19978/2016

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, AURANGABAD IRRIGATION DIVISION,
AURANGABAD AND ANR
VERSUS
RANJAKRAO PATILBA SHINDE

. . .

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Patil Ruturaj C.
Mr. so Kotkar, Adv. for Respondent/s.

...
CORAM : P.R. BORA, J.
Dated: July 29, 2016
...

PER COURT :-

1) Heard. These applications are filed seeking leave to appeal against the Judgment and Award passed in respective Land Acquisition References (for short, LARs) stating that the present applicant, for whose benefits the subject lands were acquired, was not made party to the LARs in the trial court. The contention so raised is opposed by the learned Counsel appearing for the original claimants, stating that when the lands were acquired and Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, was issued, the present Corporation had not come into existence.

2) In view of the fact that during pendency of the LAR, the applicant/Corporation had come into existence and the further fact that all the

BDV

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

liabilities of the subject lands were transferred to the present applicant, in fact, the present applicant, ought to have been made party before the Reference Court itself. In the circumstances, I am inclined to allow the present applications.

3) The applications seeking leave to file First Appeals are allowed in terms of prayer clause (B) of the application and disposed of.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

...