IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

914 FIRST APPEAL NO. 3501 OF 2011

THE STATE OF MAH THR COLLECTOR LATUR AND ANR
VERSUS
MAROTI HIRALAL RATHOD
...
AGP for appellants/State : Mr. D.R. Korde
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. H.B. Nandgavale h/f. Mr. V.G. Sakolkar
...

915 FIRST APPEAL NO. 3504 OF 2011

THE STATE OF MAH THR COLLECTOR LATUR AND ANR
VERSUS
SAJADA SATTARKHAN PATAN
...
AGP for appellants/State : Mr. A.D. Wange
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. H.B. Nandgavale h/f. Mr. V.G. Sakolkar
...

916 FIRST APPEAL NO. 3505 OF 2011

THE STATE OF MAH THR. COLLECTOR, LATUR AND ANR
VERSUS
RAJU DEVIDAS CHAVAN
...
AGP for appellants/State : Mr. B.A. Shinde
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. H.B. Nandgavale h/f. Mr. V.G. Sakolkar
...
WITH
X-OBJECTION (STAMP) NO. 26466 OF 2016 IN FA/3505/2011
...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.
Dated : October 27, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the respective parties.

2. The present appeals and cross objection arise out of the Judgment and Award dated 20.3.2010 passed by the learned Jt. Civil Judge, Senior Division, Ahmedpur, in LAR Nos. 283/2007, 281/2007 and 280/2007.

3. The lands of the claimants situated at village Ralga, Taluka

Ahmedpur, District Latur were acquired for the purpose of Percolation Tank No. 4 at village Ralga. Notification under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act came to be issued on 16.9.2004.

4. Both the learned counsel for respective parties have tendered across the Bar a copy of the judgment and order dated 9.10.2026 passed by this Court in FA No. 3503/2011 (The State of Maharashtra Vs. Shankar Bhima Chavan) and other connected matter. They submit that the lands of the claimants were acquired from the same village and for the same public purpose i.e. Percolation Tank No. 4 at village Ralga, as involved in the aforesaid appeals. It is, therefore, contended that the controversy involved in the present matters is squarely covered by the judgment and order in FA No. 3503/2011 (supra) and consequently, the present matters deserve to be disposed of in terms thereof.

5. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the respective parties, and in view of the admitted position that the controversy involved in the present matters is identical to the one decided by this court in FA No. 3503/2011 (supra), I see no reason to take a different view. The present matters, therefore, deserve to be disposed of in terms of the said judgment and order. Hence, the following order:

O R D E R

(i) The appeals filed by the State and the cross-objection filed by the claimant are partly allowed.

(ii) The impugned Judgment and Award is modified to the extent that the Respondents/Claimants are entitled to compensation at the rate of Rs.2,37,500/- per Hectare for their acquired land.

(iii) The Respondents/Claimants are entitled to all statutory benefits

including interest under Sections 28 and 34 of the Act from the date of the award as per the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in **State of Maharashtra Vs. Kailash Shiva Rangari, reported in 2016(3) Mh.L.J. 457.**

(iv) Rest of the impugned award remains unaltered.

(v) Modified award be drawn accordingly.

(vi) The Claimants to pay deficit Court fees, if any.

(vii) Pending civil applications, if any, are also disposed of.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)

ssc/