IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

910 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 8714 OF 2012
IN FAST/11559/2012 WITH CA/8715/2012 IN
FAST/11559/2012 WITH CA/8717/2012 IN
FAST/11692/2012 WITH CA/8718/2012 IN
FAST/11692/2012 WITH CA/8720/2012 IN
FAST/11701/2012 WITH CA/8721/2012 IN
FAST/11701/2012 WITH CA/8723/2012 IN
FAST/11709/2012 WITH CA/8724/2012 IN
FAST/11709/2012 WITH CA/8726/2012 IN
FAST/11732/2012 WITH CA/8727/2012 IN
FAST/11732/2012 WITH CA/8729/2012 IN
FAST/11720/2012 WITH CA/8743/2012 IN
FAST/11696/2012 WITH CA/8744/2012 IN
FAST/11696/2012 WITH CA/8746/2012 IN
FAST/11677/2012 WITH CA/8748/2012 IN
FAST/11677/2012 WITH CA/8752/2012 IN
FAST/11685/2012 WITH CA/8753/2012 IN
FAST/11685/2012 WITH CA/8755/2012 IN
FAST/11726/2012 WITH CA/8756/2012 IN
FAST/11726/2012 WITH CA/8758/2012 IN
FAST/11681/2012 WITH CA/8759/2012 IN
FAST/11681/2012 WITH CA/8761/2012 IN
FAST/11689/2012 WITH CA/8762/2012 IN
FAST/11689/2012 WITH CA/8764/2012 IN
FAST/11702/2012 WITH CA/8765/2012 IN
FAST/11702/2012 WITH CA/8767/2012 IN
FAST/11673/2012 WITH CA/8768/2012 IN
FAST/11673/2012 WITH 8730/2012 IN FAST/11720/2012

THE GMIDC, THR. ITS EXECUTIVE ENGINEER, LATUR
VERSUS
BAPUSAHEB ANNASAHEB DESHPANDE, DIED THR. L.RS. SATYABHAMA AND ORS
...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Gaikwad Anil M.
AGP for Respondents/State : Mr. K.B. Jadhavar
Advocate for Respondent No.1 : Mr. G.L. Deshpande
...

CORAM : P.R. BORA, J.
DATED : 12th OCTOBER, 2018.

PER COURT:-

. Heard Shri Gaikwad, the learned counsel appearing for the applicant and the learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

2. It is contended that the GMIDC was not party respondent in the reference applications and hence, it could not defend the reference applications. The learned counsel has therefore prayed for granting leave to appeal.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents have opposed for granting any such leave stating that the GMIDC was duly represented through AGP and it cannot be accepted that there was no representation. However, in the alternative, the learned counsel submitted that having regard to the fact that the acquisitions are of the year 1994, if the acquiring body is ready to immediately argue the appeals filed by it finally, claimants may not have any objection for granting leave as well as for condoning the delay which has occasioned in approaching this Court.

4. The learned counsel Shri Gaikwad was prompt enough in submitting that the acquiring body

is ready to argue matter finally if the delay is condoned and leave is granted by this Court. In view of the submissions so made, the following order is passed:

ORDER

i) The applications seeking leave to appeal as well as applications for condonation of delay stands allowed.

ii) Appeals be registered in accordance with law.

Iii) List the appeals for further consideration on 24.10.2018.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

Mujaheed//