

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

947 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2692 OF 2016
IN FAST/20008/2015 WITH CA/9125/2015 IN FAST/20008/2015
WITH CA/9126/2015 IN FAST/20008/2015 WITH CA/9330/2015 IN
FAST/19993/2015 WITH CA/9331/2015 IN FAST/19993/2015 WITH
CA/10087/2015 IN FAST/19996/2015 WITH CA/10088/2015 IN
FAST/19996/2015 WITH CA/10099/2015 IN FAST/19999/2015
WITH CA/10100/2015 IN FAST/19999/2015 WITH CA/2693/2016
IN FAST/19996/2015 WITH CA/2694/2016 IN FAST/19999/2015
WITH CA/2695/2016 IN FAST/19993/2015

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, MINOR PROJECT DIVISION THR
MEDIUM PROJECT DIVISION, NANDE
VERSUS
SAMBHA GOVIND MADGE DIED THR LRS GANGABAI AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Applicants : Patil Raturaj C.
Advocate for Respondent/original claimants : Yogesh Deshmukh
...

CORAM : T.V. NALAWADE, J.
DATED : 4th March, 2016.

ORDER :

1. In applications filed for brining legal heirs of deceased respondent Radheshyam Patil on record, advocate Shri. Yogesh Patil submits that he is appearing for proposed legal heirs. His Vakilpatra is accepted. In view of this circumstance, both the sides are heard. In view of the contents of the applications and submissions made, the applications are allowed. Permission is granted to bring the legal heirs of deceased respondent as prayed in the applications. Delay, if any, in bring legal heirs on record is condoned. Legal heirs are to

be immediately brought on record. Applications are disposed of.

2. In delay condonation applications, heard both the sides. Delay of 1239, 1251 etc. days are caused in filing appeals. In view of the contentions made in the applications and submissions made that some time was consumed in getting certified copies, some time was consumed in processing the matters, some time was consumed for obtaining sanction at various level, this Court holds that sufficient cause is shown. Applications are allowed. Delay are condoned.

3. Appeals are **admitted**. Notice after admission is waived by Shri. Yogesh Deshmukh for all the original claimants.

4. In stay applications, the learned counsel for original claimants submits that even when sufficient time was given by this Court to deposit the amount and when time was also extended, the amount is not yet deposited. It is not disputed that the amount is not yet deposited even after making the order of extending time for depositing the amount. In view of these circumstances, stay applications are disposed of as rejected. It is to be presumed that there is no stay to the execution proceedings.

[T.V. NALAWADE, J.]

ssc/