



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

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAF) NO.563 OF 2024 IN
FIRST APPEAL ST. NO.16856 OF 2023

Ab. Sayeed Ab. Rashid .Vs. State of Mah., and another

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Shri A.B. Darekar, Advocate for appellant.

Ms M.R. Kavimandan, A.G.P. for respondents/State.

Shri M.A. Kadu, Advocate for respondent No.2.

CORAM : SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.
DATED : 19/11/2024

1. Shri Kadu, learned advocate waives service of notice for the respondent No.2. It is further submits that respondent No.2 is going to file Vakalatnama today itself.
2. Heard learned advocates for both sides.
3. Perused the application.
4. The learned A.G.P. and learned advocate for respondents strongly objected the application and submits that, to reject the application, considering period of delay.
5. The learned advocate for the appellant pointed out in case of *Imrat lal and others Vs. Land Acquisition Collector*, reported in 2014 (9) Scale 446 had observed in para 13:

“13. we can taken judicial notice of the fact that villagers in our country are by and large illiterate and are not conversant with the intricacies of law. They are usually guided by their co-villagers, who are familiar with the proceedings in the courts or advocates with whom they get in touch for redressal of their grievance. Affidavits filed in support of the application for condonation of delay are

usually drafted by the advocates on the basis of half backed information made available by the affected persons. Therefore in the acquisition matters involving claim for award of just compensation, the court should adopt a liberal approach and either grant time to the party to file better affidavit to explain delay or suo motu take cognizance of the fact that large number of other similarly situated persons who were affected by the determination of compensation by the Land Acquisition Officer or the reference court have been granted relief.”

6. Considering reason stated in the application as well as ratio laid down in the authority of *Imrat Lal* cited (Supra), and the appellant having poor financial condition, the application therefore deserves to be allowed.

7. It is made clear that in view of the decision in the case of *New Okhla Industrial Development Authority v. Rameshwar @ Ramesh Chandra Sharma (Dead), through Legal Heir and another*, reported in (2022 SCC Online SC 1599), the original land owners/claimants/appellants herein shall not be entitled to get any statutory benefits, including the interest payment under the Land Acquisition Act on the enhanced amount of compensation for the delayed period.

8. The application is **allowed** and **disposed**.

FIRST APPEAL ST. NO.16856 OF 2023

1. Issue notice to the respondents.

2. The learned A.G.P. waives service of notice for the respondent No.1.

3. Shri Kadu, learned advocate waives service of notice for the respondent No.2.

4. **Admit.**

5. Call record and proceedings.
6. Stand over to **12.12.2024**.

(SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.)