



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

23 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3124 OF 2024
IN FAST/36363/2023

PARASRAM HAMU RATHOD

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE COLLECTOR JALNA AND
ORS.

...

24 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3865 OF 2024
IN FAST/36353/2023

...

25 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3866 OF 2024
IN FAST/36358/2023

...

26 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3874 OF 2024
IN FAST/36314/2023

...

27 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3876 OF 2024
IN FAST/36324/2023

...

28 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3878 OF 2024
IN FAST/36365/2023

...

29 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3882 OF 2024
IN FAST/36357/2023

...

30 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 3891 OF 2024
IN FAST/39818/2023

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Kakde S.m. And Kakade D.m.
AGP for Respondent nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. S.V. Hange and Mrs. M.N. Ghanekar in
respective matters
Advocate for Respondent No. 3 : Mr. Vaibhav P. Deshmukh

...

CORAM : SHAILESH P BRAHME, J.

DATE : 10.11.2025

PER COURT :

Heard both sides.

2. Following are the details of the applications, which are for condonation of delay caused in preferring appeals.

Sr. No.	Particulars	C.A. Nos.	No. of days of delay	Date of filing of C.A.	Date of 1 st order
1)	Parasram Hamu Rathod Vs. The State of Maharashtra	3124/2024	1557	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
2)	Sheshrao Baburao Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra	3865/2024	1651	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
3)	Surat Fula Rathod Died Vs. The State of Maharashtra	3866/2024	1556	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
4)	Waghu Baburao Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra	3874/2024	1488	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
5)	Shayamrao Ratan Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra	3876/2024	1515	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
6)	Bhura Fula Rathod Died Vs. State of Maharashtra	3878/2024	1655	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
7)	Sumanbai Parasram Rathod Vs. State of Mah.	3882/2024	1463	10.11.2023	19.09.2024
8)	Subhash Baburao Rathod Vs. State of Maharashtra	3891/2024	1684	28.12.2023	19.09.2024

3. The learned counsel for the applicants submits that for the reasons stated in the application delay needs to be condoned. The applicants are ready to give up interest and statutory benefits for the delayed period.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent-Acquiring Body opposes the application. It is submitted that no sufficient and convincing grounds are mentioned for condonation of delay. The applicants are casual in their approach.

5. I have gone through the applications. The averments in the applications are not controverted by the respondent-Acquiring Body. No

mala fides can be inferred from the applications on the part of the applicants. I propose to adopt a pragmatic approach in condoning the delay by imposing certain conditions. It seems that after filing of the matters those were not circulated for a period of about 10 months. The lapses are attributable to the applicants. They are not entitled for any benefits for this period also.

6. The delay stands condoned on condition that the applicants shall not be entitled to claim interest and the statutory benefits for the delayed period, the length of which is mentioned in the above table and for the lapses from the date of filing of the civil applications till securing of the first order mentioned in the above table.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

mkd/-