IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

936 FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO.11091 OF 2012
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6252 OF 2012
IN FAST/11091/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR
VERSUS
KHIRAJI TUKARAM PHARTADE AND ANR
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicants/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.2.
...
AND
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO.11094 OF 2012
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6255 OF 2012
IN FAST/11094/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
VERSUS
DADABHAU SANTU DEOKAR AND ORS
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

AND
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6256 OF 2012
IN FAST/11094/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA
VERSUS
DADABHAU SANTU DEOKAR AND ORS
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

AND
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO.11030 OF 2012
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6249 OF 2012

IN FAST/11030/2012

THE STATE OF MAH THR COLLECTOR
VERSUS
BAJIRAO BABU KESKAR AND ORS
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6250 OF 2012
IN FAST/11030/2012

THE STATE OF MAH THR COLLECTOR
VERSUS
BAJIRAO BABU KESKAR AND ORS
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6251 OF 2012
IN FAST/11091/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR
VERSUS
KHIRAJI TUKARAM PHARTADE AND ANR
...
Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent No.1.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.2.

AND
FIRST APPEAL (STAMP) NO.11088 OF 2012
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6253 OF 2012
IN FAST/11088/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR
VERSUS
SONA SAHEBA KESKAR AND ORS
...

Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6254 OF 2012
IN FAST/11088/2012

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANR
VERSUS
SONA SAHEBA KESKAR AND ORS

...

Mr. B. A. Shinde, AGP for the Applicant/State.
Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. Santosh S. Dambe, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 1st OCTOBER, 2026

P.C.:-

CIVIL APPLICATIONS FOR DELAY:-

1. By these applications, the Applicants are seeking condonation of delay in filing first appeals.

2. Considering the averments made in the applications, delay is condone. Accordingly, the applications are allowed.

FIRST APPEALS:-

3. Since the acquisition proceedings pertain to the year 2000, the appeals are heard finally with the consent of the learned Advocates for the respective parties.

4. By the present appeals, the Appellants/State are challenging

the judgment and award dated 08.09.2009 passed by the learned District Judge-1, Beed in LAR Nos.710/2007, 711/2007, 133/2007 and 134/2007.

5. Both the learned Advocates submit that the learned Reference Court has granted compensation towards the lands and no compensation was awarded towards the trees and, therefore, in view of the fact that the matter is taken up for hearing.

6. Brief facts of the present cases are as under:-

(i) The lands of the Claimants were acquired for the purpose of construction of Dhorkarwadi Village, Tank No.2 in File No.LAQ/SR/22/97.

(ii) The Notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, "the Act") was published on 23.03.2000 and possession of the lands was taken by the Respondents on 14.03.1995.

(iii) The Special Land Acquisition Officer (SLAO) passed an award on 01.09.2003 and granted compensation at the rate of Rs.250/- per R, whereas the learned Reference Court has granted Rs.1,500/- per R, i.e. slightly more than four times the amount awarded by the SLAO.

7. Mr. B. A. Shinde, learned AGP for the Appellants/State, submits that the learned Reference Court recorded a finding that even

before the SLAO, there were three sale instances from the acquired village and, considering the highest sale instance which was before the SLAO, the learned Reference Court has determined the compensation.

8. Mr. Dattatraya R. Jayabhar, learned Advocate for Respondent No.1, supports the order passed by the learned Reference Court.

9. Having heard the learned Advocates for the respective parties and with their able assistance, I have gone through the record and proceedings. Considering the sale instances which were before the SLAO, the learned Reference Court has enhanced the compensation from Rs.500/- per R to Rs.1,500/- per R, which is slightly more than four times.

10. In fact the State Government vide Government Resolution No.Sankirna-2014/Prak.Kra.4/Bham-1/A-4 dated 03.11.2016 with Corrigendum dated 23.02.2017 and 13.08.2018 to the said Government Resolution, took a decision not to challenge the reference, if compensation is enhanced only upto four times.

11. This Court is of the view that the compensation awarded by the learned Reference Court is just, reasonable and proper and the learned Reference Court has not granted excessive or exorbitant compensation so as to warrant interference with the order passed by the learned Reference Court.

12. Therefore, no case is made out to interfere with the judgment and award dated 08.09.2009 passed by the learned District Judge-1, Beed in LAR Nos.710/2007, 711/2007, 133/2007 and 134/2007.

13. Hence, the present appeals are dismissed. No order as to costs.

14. Pending civil applications, if any, are also disposed of.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)