

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

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

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1121 OF 2016
IN FAST/37964/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O
VERSUS
MUKTABAI GANPATRAO BORADE

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1125 OF 2016
IN FAST/37955/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O
VERSUS
SUDAM BAPURAO TANPURE

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1128 OF 2016
IN FAST/37943/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O
VERSUS
BHAGWAN SHESHERAO MOTE

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1134 OF 2016
IN FAST/37937/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O
VERSUS
PUNJARAM BHIMRAO BORADE

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2142 OF 2016
IN FAST/369/2016

THE GMIDC SINCHAN BHAWAN, AURANGABAD THR THE EXE
ENGINEER, LOWER DUDHANA PROJECT

VERSUS

TUKARAM BHIMRAO BORADE

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2214 OF 2016
IN FAST/37971/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O

VERSUS

SAMPATRAO SHANKARRAO WAGH

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2217 OF 2016
IN FAST/37949/2015

THE GMIDC AURANGABAD THR THE EXE ENGINEER, LOWER
DUDHANA PROJECT DIV., SELU AND O

VERSUS

GULAB LAXMAN MHASKE

...

Advocate for Applicants : Mr. Tandale P. R.

CORAM: T. V. NALAWADE, J.

DATED: 24th FEBRUARY, 2016.

PER COURT:

1. All these applications are filed for condonation of delay. Heard learned counsel for the Applicants.
2. In view of the contents of the applications and the submissions made, that some time was consumed for collecting certified copies, some time was consumed for processing the matters and some time was consumed for getting sanctions at various levels, this Court holds that sufficient cause is shown.

-(3):-

1121

3. In the result, delay is condoned. All the applications are allowed and disposed of accordingly.

(T. V. NALAWADE, J.)

Dt.24/02/2016.
ans/1121