

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 7868 OF 2024

UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Digitally
signed by
UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Date:
2025.11.14
21:15:40
+0530

Suryakant Gajanan Swami

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

... Respondent

.....
Mr. Ramdas Shelake a/w Ms. Vaishnavi Shelake, Mr. Swapnil Lokare,
Nikhil Dharmadhikari for the Petitioner.
Ms. T.J. Kapre, AGP for the Respondent - State.
.....

**Coram : M. S. Karnik &
Ajit B. Kadethankar, JJ.**

Date : November 13, 2025.

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that petitioner is the owner and possessor of Inam land located in Gat No. 346, admeasuring 8 Acre, 76 R, situated at Daphalapur, Tal. Jath, Dist. Sangli. He would submit that the land is in fact Devasthan land. He would further submit that the respondent nos. 2 and 3 have acquired the petitioner's subject matter land and has granted compensation to the

petitioner under the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. He would further submit that being aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the quantum of compensation, the petitioner has presented the representation to the Sub-Divisional Officer, Jath, Dist. Sangli on 19th January 2022. He would submit that even prior before this representation, notice was also sent to the concerned authority on 18th December 2021. Learned counsel would submit that despite this representation and notice, neither any enhanced compensation is paid to the petitioner nor even any response is received by the petitioner. As such, he would submit that directions may be issued to the concerned Officer to decide this representation and to grant enhanced compensation.

3. Learned AGP would submit that from the record it reveals that representation filed by the petitioner as also the notice given by the petitioner, are not yet decided nor responded by the concerned authority.

4. In view of this, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondent nos. 2 to 5 to decide the representation filed by the petitioner within a period of 16 weeks from today. In the meantime, the petitioner may

resubmit comprehensive proposal or representation before the concerned authority by adding any such documents as he deems fit to substantiate his grievance.

5. Needless to mention that the concerned authorities shall decide the grievances of the petitioner by giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, who shall be at liberty to have legal assistance.

6. We make it clear that we have not commented on the entitlement of the petitioner to get any enhancement in the compensation as also his entitlement to receive any compensation. The respondents authority shall decide the claim of the petitioner on its own merits. All contentions are kept open.

7. Learned counsel would submit that petitioner would submit his proposal as allowed by this Court within two weeks from today. Learned AGP undertakes to inform the respondent authority of this order forthwith.

8. With this, the Writ Petition stands disposed of. Order accordingly.

[Ajit B. Kadethankar, J.]

[M. S. Karnik]