

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

**CIVIL APPLICATION (CAF) NO.235/2021**

**IN**

**FIRST APPEAL ST. NO.25587/2019**

**Ashok s/o Mawanji Narewad**

**...Versus...**

**State of Maharashtra, through the Collector, Yavatmal and others**

-----  
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
appearances, Court's orders or directions  
and Registrar's orders  
-----

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri K.S. Narwade, Advocate for applicant  
Mrs. Mayuri Deshmukh, AGP for respondent nos.1 and 3  
Shri K.R. Lule, Advocate for respondent no.2

**CORAM : AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.**

**DATE : 22/11/2022**

1. The civil application seeks condonation of delay of 4319 days in filing the first appeal against the judgment of the Reference Court. Though a statement is made in para 4 of the application regarding waiver of interest for the period of delay, the Hon'ble Apex Court in *New Okhla Industrial Development Authority Vs. Rameshwar @ Ramesh Chandra Sharma (Dead) Through Legal Heir and another, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1599*, has held as under :-

*“10. However, at the same time the acquiring body and the beneficiary of acquisition shall not be saddled with the liability of statutory benefits and the interest*

*which may be available under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for the delayed period. In the present case the delay of 22 years can be said to be a substantial delay. However, as the claimants are held to be entitled the enhanced amount of compensation, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the High Court can be said to be justified in condoning the delay. However, at the same time, the High Court has erred in awarding other statutory benefits and interest for the delayed period. To saddle with the liability to pay statutory benefits and interest for the delayed period upon the beneficiary/acquiring body would be a financial burden upon the public body and it may increase the project cost which shall be against the public interests. It cannot be disputed that the liability towards the statutory benefits and the interest under the Act, 1984 would be a huge liability considering the interest at the rate of 15% per annum, solatium, price rise etc. Therefore, while condoning the delay and enhancing the amount of compensation at par with other land owners, the High Court ought not to have saddled the liability upon the appellant to pay statutory benefits and the interest payable under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for the delayed period. To the aforesaid extent the impugned common judgment and order passed by the High Court is required to be modified and the present appeals are required to be partly allowed to the aforesaid extent.*

*11. In view of the above and for the reasons stated above all these Appeals Succeed in part. The impugned common judgment and order passed by the High Court passed in respective appeals is hereby partly allowed to the aforesaid extent denying the statutory benefits and the interest which may be payable under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 for the period between the judgment and award passed by the Reference Court i.e. 15.12.1993 till the respective first appeals were filed after curing the defects. Meaning thereby the original land owners/claimants shall not be entitled to any statutory benefits including the interest payable under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 on the enhanced amount of compensation for the period between 15.12.1993 till the respective first appeals after curing the defects were filed.*"

2. In view of the above and in view of what has been held in ***Ningappa Thotappa Angadi (Dead) through L.Rs. Vs. The Special Land Acquisition Officer and another, 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1611***, the delay is condoned subject to the condition that the original land owner/claimant (appellant herein) shall not be entitled to any statutory benefits including the interest payable under the Land Acquisition Act on the enhanced amount of compensation for the period of delay. The civil application is accordingly allowed, subject to what is stated above.

**FIRST APPEAL ST. NO.25587/2019**

1. Assistant Government Pleader Mrs. Mayuri Deshmukh appears for the respondent nos.1 and 3 and Advocate Shri K.R. Lule appears for the respondent no.2.
2. Shri Narwade, learned counsel for the appellant submits that the matter is covered by the judgment of this Court in *Ganesh Dattatray Bhusale (Deceased) through L.Rs. Sulochana Ganesh Bhusale and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra, through Collector, Yavatmal, Distt. Yavatmal [First Appeal No.479/2015, dated 09/07/2019]* (pg.24) and *Ashokkumar s/o Deobharao Naik Vs. The State of Maharashtra, through Collector, Yavatmal and others [First Appeal No.1330/2008, dated 03/10/2019]* (pg.29), considering which, learned Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent nos.1 and 3 and the learned counsel for the respondent no.2 to examine this position and make a statement in that regard.
3. List the matter on 29/11/2022.

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)