

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.

First Appeal No. 130 of 2005

Appellants : Maharashtra Industrial Development Corporation, through its Chief Executive Officer, Having its Regional office at Amravati Industrial Estate, By pass Road, Amravati.

versus

Respondents : 1) Motiram Lachiram Jadhav ... Since deceased,
through his legal representatives -
1-a. Uttam Motiram Jadhav, aged 65 years, Agriculturist,
1-b. Sudhakar Motiram Jadhav, aged 50 years, Agriculturist
1-c. ~~Manohar Motiram Jadhav, aged 45 years, agriculturist~~
(Deleted as per court order dated 22/7/2022)

1-d. Vinod Motiram Jadhav, aged 42
years, Agriculturist

Madhukar Motiram Jadhav (Dead)

1-e. Smt. Sushilabai Madhukar Jadhav,
aged about 48 years, Agriculturist

1-f. **Ramlal** Madhukar Jadhav, aged 25
years, Agriculturist

**(corrected as per court order dated
22/7/2022)**

1-g. Babulal Madhukar Jadhav, aged 22
years, Agriculturist

Smt. Prayagbai Mersingh Rathod...
Dead

1-h. Sanjay Mersingh Rathod, aged
about 19 years, Agriculturist

1-i. **Saru** Narayan Rathod, aged 39
years, Agriculturist

**(correction carried out as per
Hon'ble Court's order dated
11/01/2023)**

1-j. Uddhao Motiram Jadhao, aged 52
years

1-k. Ganesh Motiram Jadhao, aged 52
years

All residents of Ghatodi, Jyoti Nagar,
Tahsil Pusad, District-Yavatmal.

- 2) The Collector, Yavatmal
- 3) The Land Acquisition Officer i.e. the
Sub-Divisional Officer, Pusad,
District-Yavatmal.

Shri M.M. Agnihotri, Advocate for appellant

Shri D.G. Patil, Advocate for Legal Representatives of
deceased respondent no.1

Ms A.R. Kulkarni, Assistant Government Pleader for respondents
2 & 3

Coram : A. S. Chandurkar, J.

Dated : 16th February, 2017

Oral Judgment

1. Not on board. However, as connected appeals have been decided today, this appeal is also taken up for final hearing.

2. Learned counsel for the parties agree that the question raised in the present appeal has been decided today in First Appeal No.149 of 2005 and connected appeals, and the appeals filed by the Corporation have been dismissed after maintaining the order passed by the Reference Court.

3. Hence, for the reasons assigned in the common judgment delivered in First Appeal No. 149 of 2005 and connected appeals, this appeal stands dismissed. The judgment of the Reference Court stands confirmed. No order as to costs.

A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.

joshi/gulande