

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

**920 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 265 OF 2023
IN WP/1086/2018**

**HIRAMAN SONAJI DHOLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...
Advocate for Applicants : Mr. C.K. Shinde
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 : Ms. S.S. Joshi
Advocate for Respondent No. 4 : Mr. Sagar Raut
h/f. Mr. S.S. Deve

...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ.**

DATE : 01 MARCH 2024

PER COURT :

We have heard both the sides.

2. By filing a Writ Petition, a direction was solicited for modification of the award in view of the recommendations made by the Competent Authority. A prayer was made for directing the Land Acquisition Officer to decide and finalize the representations filed by the petitioners.

3. By the order sought to be reviewed, the Writ Petition was disposed of by observing that it was appropriate for the petitioners to avail of the alternate remedy to approach the competent authority for

redressal of their grievance and granting the liberty, Writ Petition was disposed of.

4. Learned AGP tenders across the bar a copy of the communication dated 21 September 2023 addressed to the petitioners by the Special Land Acquisition Officer, informing them that no modification as was being sought could be made, in the process referring to Section 33 (1) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

5. Obviously, the applicants will have to challenge the decision. There is no error apparent on the face of the record which would enable us to undertake a review. The application is rejected with liberty to the applicants to challenge the order / decision.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]