

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

945 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8292 OF 2017
IN FIRST APPEAL [STAMP] NO.7011/2017

SAKHARAM LAXMAN MUNDKAR & ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & OTHERS

...

Mr.S.V.Kurundkar, Advocate for the applicants.
Mr.R.D.Sanap, AGP for the respondent-State.
Mr.Umakant Giri, Advocate for respondent no.3.

...

AND

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8293 OF 2017
IN FIRST APPEAL [STAMP] NO.7009 OF 2017

NAGORAO SAMBHAJI MUNDKAR & ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & OTHERS

...

Mr.S.V.Kurundkar, Advocate for the applicants.
Mr.R.D.Sanap, AGP for the respondent-State.
Mr.Sham B. Patil, Advocate for respondent no.3.

...

**CORAM : V. K. JADHAV, J.
DATED : 01.09.2021**

PER COURT :

1] Heard learned counsel for the applicants, learned AGP for the respondent-State and learned counsel appearing for respondent no.3 – acquiring body.

2] The applicants are the original claimants. There is delay of 169 days caused in preferring appeal.

3] Learned counsel for the applicants – original claimants submits that there are errors about calculations in the judgment, consequently, the Reference Court has corrected the said judgment, as such, technically there is delay caused in preferring appeals.

4] Learned counsel appearing for the other-side have also not disputed this position.

5] In view of above and for the reasons stated in the applications, the applications are allowed in terms of prayer clause-B and same are disposed of accordingly.

[V. K. JADHAV, J.]

DDC