

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

958 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.3259 OF 2021
IN
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 37146 OF 2019

THE G.M.I.D.C., THR ITS EX. ENGINEER, MINOR IRRIGATION
DIVISION, OSMANABAD AND OTHERS
VERSUS
BABA BHAGWAN GAIKWAD

AND
958 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.3261 OF 2021
IN
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 37142 OF 2019

THE G.M.I.D.C., THR ITS EX. ENGINEER, MINOR IRRIGATION
DIVISION, OSMANABAD AND OTHERS
VERSUS
NARAYAN SOPAN KAWADE AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the Appellant : Shri R. B. Gaikwad
AGP for the Co-Appellant : Shri S. B. Pulkundwar
Advocate for the Respondents : Shri N. R. Thorat h/f.
Shri R. K. Shingnapure

...

CORAM : N. J. JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 11th MARCH, 2021

...

PER COURT :

These are applications for condonation of 783 days delay in preferring the appeal against the judgment and award passed by the learned Civil Judge, Senior Division Bhoom, in L.A.R. Nos. 206/2014 and 210/2014 dated 06/07/2017.

2. The applicants – appellants aver that there was delay in preferring the appeal on account of obtaining the necessary approvals from the concerned authorities and in making arrangements to file the appeal.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent/s – original claimant/s submits that they have no objection to condone the delay.

4. It is trite that an application for condonation of delay should receive liberal consideration. The courts lean in favour of condonation of delay so as to advance the cause of substantive justice and facilitate the adjudication of the matter on merits rather than delay and laches. Having regard to the impersonal nature of the applicant some allowance is required to be given for the time consumed in initiating the steps to obtain the necessary approvals and make arrangement for filing the appeal. Ultimately, public interest may suffer if the applicants are not allowed to seek adjudication on merits.

5. An useful reference in this context can be made to the pronouncements of the Supreme Court in the cases of *Collector, Land Acquisition, Anantnag and another Vs. Mst. Katiji and others – (1987)* 2 Supreme Court Cases 107 and *N. Balakrishnan Vs. M.*

Krishnamurthy- (1998) 7 Supreme Court Cases 123, wherein the approach to be adopted was delineated and the principles which ought to govern the exercise of discretion were expounded.

6. On the aforesaid touchstone, having regard to the impersonal nature of the applicants, the reasons assigned in the application and to advance the cause of substantive justice, the delay deserves to be condoned.

Hence following order :-

- (a) The applications stand allowed.
- (b) The delay of 783 days caused in preferring the appeal stands condoned.
- (c) The Appeals be registered.

7. The applications stand disposed of.

(N. J. JAMADAR, J.)

shp/-