



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

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6391 OF 2012
IN FAST/11494/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Shewantabai Bhikaji Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6392 OF 2012
IN FAST/11494/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Shewantabai Bhikaji Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 11494 OF 2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Appellant

Versus

Shewantabai Bhikaji Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

**AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6393 OF 2012
IN FAST/11498/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Kundlik Parvati Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6394 OF 2012
IN FAST/11498/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Kundlik Parvati Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 11498 OF 2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Appellant

Versus

Kundlik Parvati Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6398 OF 2012
IN FAST/11502/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Manisha Bapu Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6399 OF 2012
IN FAST/11502/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Manisha Bapu Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 11502 OF 2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Appellant

Versus

Manisha Bapu Rode And Anr. .. Respondents

**AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6396 OF 2012
IN FAST/11505/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Shripati Parvati Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6397 OF 2012
IN FAST/11505/2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Applicant

Versus

Shripati Parvati Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

**WITH
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO. 11505 OF 2012**

The State Of Maharashtra .. Appellant

Versus

Shripati Parvati Rode And Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. R. B. Dhaware, AGP for the Applicants/Appellants.
Mr. Mahesh R. Sonawane, Advocate for Respondents/claimants

**CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.
DATE : 10th SEPTEMBER, 2025.**

PER COURT :-

CIVIL APPLICATIONS FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY :

1. In Civil Application No. 6391/2012, the learned advocate Mr. Sonawane appears for respondent Nos. 2 to 4. The respondent No. 4 is the only legal heir of deceased respondent No. 1. He submits that, there are no heirs of respondent No. 1 and therefore, he need not to bring on record legal heirs.

2. In the civil applications, there is delay of 968 days caused in filing the first appeals. For the reasons recorded in the applications, delay stands condoned. The civil applications are allowed. Office to register first appeals.

FIRST APPEALS :

1. All these appeals are arising out of judgment and award dated 07.01.2008 passed by the learned C.J.S.D., Shrigonda in respective L.A.Rs. as per the chart below :

Sr. No	F.A. with C.A. No.	LAR No.	Land Acquired	SLAO Rate	Reference Court Rate
1	CA 6391/12 IN FAST 11494/2012	707/2003	1 H 80 R	Rs. 79,145/-	Rs. 17,6095/-
2	CA 6369/12 IN FAST 11505/2012	704/2003	357.5 R	Rs. 37,088/-	Rs. 70,900/-

3	CA 6398/12 IN FAST 11502/2012	705/2003	30 R	Rs. 13,190/-	Rs. 42,540/-
4	CA 6393/12 IN FAST 11498/2012	706/2003	357.5 R	Rs. 37,087/-	Rs. 70,899/-

2. Since the appeals are arising out of common judgment and award all are taken up together. The land of the claimants came to be acquired from village Suregaon, Taluka Shrigonda, District Ahmednagar for Jabhalpattil Pazar Tank. A notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act came to be issued on 13.11.1997. Award came to be passed on 15.11.2000. In the award, learned S.L.A.O. granted compensation as given in the chart above. The learned Reference Court in references enhanced the amount which is less than double the amount in L.A.R. Nos. 707/2003, 704/2003 and 706/2003. Only in L.A.R. No. 705/2003 rate awarded is more than double, however, the same is still less than three times of the compensation awarded by the learned S.L.A.O.

2. The Government of Maharashtra vide Government Resolution dated 03.11.2016 and Corrigendum dated 23.02.2017, took a decision not to file appeals where the amount enhanced is

less than four times of the amount awarded by the learned S.L.A.O. In case, appeals are filed, the said appeals be withdrawn. In the present appeals, the compensation awarded by the learned Reference Court is within four times. The learned AGP also could not point any illegality or perversity in the impugned judgment and award. Considering this, this Court finds that, no purpose would be served by keeping the appeals pending.

3. Therefore, the first appeals stand dismissed. No order as to costs.

4. Pending civil applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(KISHORE C. SANT, J.)

PS.B.