

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 15529 OF 2019

Rajshri Udyog Through its partners
and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

.. Respondents

Mr. Ajit B. Gaikwad (Patil), Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for Respondents-State.

Mrs. Sudha Kulthe-Chintamani, Advocate for Respondent No. 2.

Mr. Deepak S. Manorkar, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

DATED : 06th MARCH, 2020.

PER COURT :-

. Heard Mr. Gaikwad, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Manorkar, learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

2. The award was passed under Section 3 (G) of the National Highways Act on 24.07.2017, subsequently for the same acquisition second award came to passed on 11.08.2017.

3. The contention of the petitioners is that the second award dated 11.08.2017 is null and void. The authority under the Act does not possess the jurisdiction and power to pass the second award.

4. Mr. Manorkar, learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 3 and 4 submits that Section 33 of the Right to Fair Compensation and

Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short 'Act of 2013') permits the authority to pass the second award.

5. This Court in a case of *Bhupendrasingh Sardarsingh Parmar Vs. Competent Authority for National Highway* under judgment dated 20.12.2019 and in a case of *Yasminbegum Bakshulla Khan and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others* with other connected writ petitions dated 08.11.2019 has held that the authority under the National Highways Act, 1956 does not possess the jurisdiction to pass the second award, nor can exercise the powers under Section 33 of the Act of 2013 interalia the second award for the same acquisition would be illegal .

6. For the reasons recorded in the aforesaid judgment the award dated 11.08.2017 stands quashed and set aside.

7. The respondents can assail the first award as may be permissible under law.

8. Writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

P.S.B.