

State of Maharashtra and Ors.	}	Petitioners
versus		
Narayan Ramchandran and Ors.	}	Respondents

Ms. Rima Paradkar i/b. M/s. D. M. Legal Associates for the respondents/original petitioners.

DATED :- DECEMBER 15, 2016

1. The further affidavit of the review petitioners (State) is taken on record.

2. Having perused the same, we are of the opinion that the order passed on the writ petition need not be reviewed. The order dated 10th October, 2013 only ensures compliance with the mandate of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. If the amount is brought and deposited in the court and a reference under section

30 of that Act is pending, then, needless to clarify that it will be open for the review petitioners to contend before that court that the amount exceeding the sum stipulated as interest has been brought in the court and appropriate adjustments and withdrawal be permitted to be made.

3. We think that in review petition we cannot decide the quantum of interest. We clarify that it would be open for the review petitioners to request the reference court to pass such orders as are permissible in law. Keeping open all contentions of both sides, particularly with regard to above, we dispose of the review petition.

4. Needless to clarify that if the computation as made by the State is disputed, the claimants would have opportunity to rebut the same.

(G.S.PATEL, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)