

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

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO.3486 OF 2022 IN  
FIRST APPEAL ST. NO. 29025 OF 2021**

Murlidhar s/o Bhimrao More & another                      Applicants

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & another                      Respondents

Mr. S. S. Chillarge, advocate for the Applicants.  
Mr. P. N. Kutti, AGP for Respondent No.1.  
Mr. B. V. Virdhe, advocate for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.**

**DATE : 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2022.**

**PC :**

Heard learned Counsel for the applicants-original claimants and also learned Counsel for contesting Respondent No.2 – acquiring body. There appears to be huge delay of 3034 days.

2            The learned Counsel for Respondent N.2-acquiring body submits that no proper cause is shown for such delay and, therefore, the application needs to be rejected.

3           The learned Counsel for the applicants submits that the Reference Court has not considered the fact that the land of the applicants was an irrigated land and also there were trees which remained to be valued while granting compensation. He also assured that the applicants would not claim any interest for the period of delay.

4           It is to be specifically noted that the Hon'ble Apex Court, in many matters, has observed that the delay in land acquisition matters is to be dealt with liberally. In view of the same, the application stands allowed and the delay of 3034 days stands condoned subject to the condition that the applicants shall not claim any interest for the aforesaid period of delay. The appeal be placed for admission after removal of office objections, if any.

**(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)**  
**JUDGE**

adb