

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2957 OF 2020
IN
FIRST APPEAL [ST] NO. 6573 OF 2020

The Exe. Engineer, P.T. and M.I. Works No. 1,
Osmanabad & Ors. ... Applicants
Versus
Arjun Maruti Raut ... Respondent

...
Mr. Umakant P. Giri – Advocate for applicants
Mr. Abhijeet S. More – Advocate for respondent-sole
....

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2966 OF 2020
IN
FIRST APPEAL [ST] NO. 6577 OF 2020

The Exe. Engineer, P.T. and M.I. Works No. 1,
Osmanabad & Ors. ... Applicants
Versus
Haridas Yashwant Padwal (died)
through LR's – Suman & Anr. ... Respondents

...
Mr. Umakant P. Giri – Advocate for applicants
....

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2950 OF 2020
IN
FIRST APPEAL [ST] NO. 6598 OF 2020

The Exe. Engineer, P.T. and M.I. Works No. 1,
Osmanabad & Ors. ... Applicants
Versus
Sangita Shrikant Padwal & Ors. ... Respondents

...
Mr. Umakant P. Giri – Advocate for applicants
Mr. L. C. Patil – Advocate for respondent nos. 1 to 3
....

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2955 OF 2020
IN
FIRST APPEAL [ST] NO. 6563 OF 2020

The Exe. Engineer, P.T. and M.I. Works No. 1,
Osmanabad & Ors. ... Applicants
Versus
Sambhaji Limbaji Padwal ... Respondent

...
Mr. Umakant P. Giri – Advocate for applicants
Mr. L. C. Patil – Advocate for respondent nos. 1 to 3
....

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2962 OF 2020
IN
FIRST APPEAL [ST] NO. 6445 OF 2020

The Exe. Engineer, P.T. and M.I. Works No. 1,
Osmanabad & Ors. ... Applicants
Versus
Shivaji Dashrath Pawar ... Respondent

...
Mr. Umakant P. Giri – Advocate for applicants
....

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.
DATE : 21st JUNE, 2023

PER COURT :

1. By these applications, the applicants are seeking to condone the delay of 2145 days caused in filing the appeal

challenging the judgment and award passed by the Reference Court in Land Acquisition Reference No. 383 of 2007.

2. The learned advocate appearing for the applicant would submit that the delay is caused on account of the administrative reasons and various procedural aspects those are required to be followed by the acquiring body.

3. The learned advocate appearing for the respondents submits that the delay is not adequately explained, however, he admits that in the connected appeals arising out of the same acquisition, the similar days delay is condoned accepting the grounds stated therein.

4. In view of the aforesaid, there is no impediment in allowing the present applications. Hence, the following order.

ORDER

- [i] Civil Applications are allowed.
- [ii] Delay of 2145 days caused in filing the appeals is condoned.
- [iii] Appeals be registered.

[S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR]
JUDGE