

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

(18)WRIT PETITION NO.2646 OF 2025

Shivaji Krishnath Patil

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

WITH

(19)WRIT PETITION NO.2647 OF 2025

WITH

(39)WRIT PETITION NO.4694 OF 2025

WITH

(41)WRIT PETITION NO.4697 OF 2025

WITH

(45)WRIT PETITION NO.4706 OF 2025

WITH

(46)WRIT PETITION NO.4708 OF 2025

WITH

(49)WRIT PETITION NO.4715 OF 2025

WITH

(50)WRIT PETITION NO.4716 OF 2025

WITH

(51)WRIT PETITION NO.4718 OF 2025

WITH

(52)WRIT PETITION (ST)NO.9820 OF 2025

WITH

(94)WRIT PETITION NO.2814 OF 2025

WITH

(98)WRIT PETITION NO.3423 OF 2025

WITH

(99)WRIT PETITION NO.3425 OF 2025

WITH

(101)WRIT PETITION NO.3449 OF 2025

WITH

(107)WRIT PETITION NO.4460 OF 2025

WITH

(108)WRIT PETITION NO.4461 OF 2025

WITH

(111)WRIT PETITION NO.4464 OF 2025

WITH

(132)WRIT PETITION NO.4705 OF 2025

WITH
(133)WRIT PETITION NO. 4710 OF 2025
WITH
(134)WRIT PETITION NO.4713 OF 2025
WITH
(135)WRIT PETITION NO.4714 OF 2025

Dr.. Ramdas Sabban a/w Mr. Shrikanth Kompelli and Mr. Rohit Chitiken for the Petitioner in all these petitions.

Mr. Akshay P. Shine, 'B' Panel a/w Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for the Respondent-State.

Mr. Sagar Varma (through VC) i/b. Mr. Sagar Laddha for Respondent No.3.

CORAM : M. S. Sonak &
Jitendra Jain, JJ.

DATED : 8 April 2025

PC.:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. In all these matters, the Petitioners contend that they have not been paid the statutory benefits like solatium and interest in terms of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Union of India Vs Tarsem Singh and Ors.***¹.
3. The learned counsel for the Respondent-State and Highway Authorities have no objections to complying with the law laid down in *Tarsem Singh (supra)* and pay the Petitioners the statutory dues, if the same have not been already been paid and further if, the Petitioners are eligible to receive the same.
4. Mr. Sagar Varma, learned counsel for Highway Authorities raise some objections with regard to some of the Petitioners by

¹ (2019) 9 SCC 304

submitting that the decision in *Tarsem Singh (supra)* would apply only to acquisition after 2015.

5. At this stage, we are not going into such issues. All that we direct is that the Petitioners must be paid the statutory benefits of solatium and interest in terms of the law laid down in *Tarsem Singh (supra)* if they have not already been paid such benefits and if they are found to be eligible to receive such benefits.

6. The above exercise must be completed within three months of the uploading of this order.

7. The Petitions are disposed of in the above terms without any cost order. All concerned to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(Jitendra Jain, J.)

(M. S. Sonak, J.)