



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 10131 OF 2025

Manohar Baliram Pachpol

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Kale Ajeet B., for Petitioner.
- Mr. S. K. Tambe, Addl. GP for Respondent – State.

CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 14th AUGUST 2025.

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The present petition is filed for the following reliefs :
 - A. *This writ petition may kindly be allowed and ;*
 - B. *To Kindly direct respondent authority to consider the objections raised by present petitioner regarding the number of forest and fruit bearing trees present in the acquired Gat No.3 of the petitioner and decide the same before publishing the final award;*
 - C. *To Kindly direct respondent authority to conduct fresh re-evaluation of forest and fruit bearing trees before publishing the final award;*
 - D. *To kindly direct respondent authority not to publish the final award without considering the forest and fruit bearing trees present in the acquired Gat No.3*

of present petitioner;

- E. To kindly direct the respondent authority to consider the NA status given to the acquired land of the petitioner in Gat No.3 and give the compensation as per NA rates to the acquired land;*
- F Any other just and equitable relief to which the petitioner found entitled may kindly be granted.”*

3. At the stage of arguments, the learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently argued and showed a number of documents filed with the writ petition, but we feel that all the arguments sought to be advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner are not relevant for the above quoted prayers.

4. In fact, we find that when the concerned Authorities are still in the process of considering the material before them and proceeding to pronounce an award for acquisition of land in accordance with law, such directions being sought at this stage itself are wholly misplaced and certainly not within the remit of writ jurisdiction.

5. We feel that the objections sought to be raised by the petitioner with regard to number of forest and fruit bearing trees etc. are issues that would arise only upon culmination of the proceedings

and the award being pronounced. If the petitioner is dissatisfied with the award, there are sufficient avenues in the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, to redress such grievances. This petition has been filed in anticipation that the concerned Authority will not be considering relevant material while publishing the final award.

6. Writ jurisdiction cannot be exercised on mere apprehensions of the petitioner and therefore, the petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)