

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 499 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.10109 OF 2018**

1. Bhagwan S/o Ramrao Zungure
Age 76 years, Occu.Agril
2. Santosh S/o Vithalrao Zungure
Age 42 years, Occu.Agril
3. Ranubai W/o Janardhan Waghmare
Age 80 years, Occu. Agril
4. Vithal S/o Bhaurao Thosar
Age 75 years, Occu.Agril

All R/o Ukhanda (Pitti),
Tq.Patoda,Dist. Beed.

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
Irrigation Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32
2. Mr Asthik Kumar Pandey
Age 30 years, Occu.Govt.Service
Collector Beed.
3. Mrs. Namrata Chate
Age 29 years, Ocu.Govt.Service,
Deputy Collector (Land Acquisition)
and S.D.O. Patoda, Dist.Beed

4. The Executive Engineer,
Irrigation Department
Barshi Naka Road, Tq.and
District-Beed.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr C. K. Shinde, Advocate for petitioners;
Mr S. D. Ghayal, A.G.P. for respondents/State

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
R.G. AVACHAT, JJ.**

DATED : 25th JULY, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioners and
learned Asstt. Govt. Pleader appearing for Deputy
Collector (Land Acquisition) and S.D.O., Patoda, Dist.
Beed.

2. Perused the order of this Court, dated 14th
December, 2018, passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.
10109 of 2018. By the said order, respondent No.3 -
Special Land Acquisition Officer, Patoda, District Beed,
was directed to decide two applications of the
petitioners, dated 1st January, 2015 and 31st May, 2006,

within a stipulated period of three months. The grievance of the petitioner is of non-compliance of the order.

3. If statements made in the petition memo are perused, it reveals that the petitioners themselves admit that the hearing of the parties was undertaken by the Special Land Acquisition Officer. The notices were issued to the petitioners and in response to the notices, the petitioners submitted their say to the authorities by engaging a Counsel. It is stated in para-5 of the petition that after submission of the say to the authorities, the petitioners were unable to know further progress in the matter and they reasonably believed that the claim is pending before respondent No.3.

4. Considering the aforesaid facts i.e. statements made on behalf of the petitioners in the petition, we are of the opinion that petition itself can be disposed of with direction to respondent No.3 and accordingly, respondent

No.3 is directed to take a decision on the aforesaid applications of the petitioners within a period of two weeks from today. The decision be informed to the petitioners within a period of one week thereafter.

The petition is accordingly disposed of with above referred directions.

Authenticated copy be supplied to the learned A.G.P. Learned A.G.P. to communicate this order to respondent No.3.

[R.G. AVACHAT, J.]

[PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.]

sjk