

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 1481 OF 2022

Vitthal S/o Gabaji Salve
Age : 79 years, Occu. Agril,
R/o. Ghaigaon, Tq. Vaijapur,
Dist. Aurangabad

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through Collector, Aurangabad

.... Respondent

.....
Mr. Yogesh D. Kale, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. Y.G. gujrathi, AGP for Respondent No.1
.....

[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 26th SEPTEMBER, 2023

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Leave to correct the prayer clause.
2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.
3. This petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, impugns the order dated 02/07/2096, passed by learned 2nd Joint Civil Judge, Senior Division, Aurangabad, in Land Acquisition Reference Nos. 436 of 1992, thereby rejecting the land acquisition reference, as the petitioners failed to adduce evidence.

4. Heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for respondent. Perused the writ petition memo, annexures thereto, impugned order.

5. Indisputably the issue involved in this petition is covered by the judgment of this Court (Coram: V.K. Jadhav, J.) in Writ Petition No. 12795 of 2019 and connected writ petitions, wherein this Court has held that the reference has to be decided on merits. Since, in those matters, references were rejected due to failure on the part of the petitioners therein to adduce evidence, this Court has held that the reference Court did not decide the references on merits and therefore set aside the orders passed by the reference Court and restored the references and directed to decide the references on merits.

6. In Writ Petition No. 1448 of 2021 (Bharat Laxmidas Thakkar vs. State of Maharashtra & Others), learned Single Judge of this Court has held:

"4. It is trite that it is a reference under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act and is not an adversarial litigation. Once a reference is made by the Special Land Acquisition Officer, it is imperative for the reference court to decide it on merits either way. It is apparent that by the impugned order, the reference court has simply dismissed it in default instead of deciding it on merits.

5. *In view of such state-of-affairs, with a rider that the petitioner is not allowed to reap the benefit of his own wrong and making him to forgo his claim for the interest for the intervening period, the writ petition can be allowed."*

7. Admittedly, in the present case also the references is not decided on merits and the same is rejected solely on the ground that the petitioners failed to adduce evidence. The present case is therefore, squarely covered by the above-referred decisions.

8. In view of aforesaid observations, following order:-

ORDER

- (I) The writ petition is allowed.
- (II) The impugned order dated 02/07/1996 passed by learned 2nd Joint Civil Judge, Senior Division, Aurangabad, in Land Acquisition Reference Nos. 436 of 1992 is hereby quashed and set aside.
- (III) The matter is relegated back to the concerned reference Court for decision on merits, after giving an opportunity to the respective parties.

- (IV) The reference Court shall expedite the hearing of the matter and decide the same within a period of six months from the date of receipt of writ of this order. Parties to co-operate.
- (V) The petitioner shall not be entitled to claim any interest for the period from the date of dismissal of the proceeding i.e. 02/07/1996 till today.

Rule is made absolute in the above terms. No costs.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI]
JUDGE

S.P. Rane