

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.3901 OF 2022

Balu Vithoba Lavate

PETITIONER

Age – 65 years, Occ – Agril

R/o Yedshi, Taluka & District - Osmanabad

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through the Collector, Osmanabad

RESPONDENTS

2. The Spl Land Acquisition Officer No.1
Osmanabad

3. Executive Engineer
Central Railway, Solapur, Pune, Latur
Now at Solapur

.....

Mr. R.V. Naiknavare, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.R. Yadav Lonikar, AGP for State.

Mr. R.B. Bhosle, Advocate for respondent No. 3.

.....

[CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]

DATE : 6th JUNE, 2023

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.

2. This petition filed under Article 227 and 300-A of the Constitution of India, impugn the order dated 30.09.2014, passed by learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Osmanabad, in

Land Acquisition Reference No. 240/2009, thereby rejecting the land acquisition reference as the petitioner failed to adduce evidence.

3. 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.

4. 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."

5. Admittedly, in the present case also the reference is not decided on merits and the same is rejected solely on the ground that the petitioner failed to adduce evidence. The present case is therefore, squarely covered by the above-referred decision

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

ORDER

- (I) The writ petition is allowed.
- (II) The impugned order dated 30.09.2014 passed by learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Osmanabad, in Land Acquisition Reference No. 240/2009, 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. 30.09.2014 till today.

Rule is made absolute in the above terms.

No costs.

[NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.]