IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

902 FIRST APPEAL NO. 1658 OF 2017

RAM SHAHAJI MANE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS
.....
Mr. Vivekanand V. Ingale, Advocate for Appellant.
Mr. A. M. Phule, AGP for Respondent-State.
Ms. Sunita D. Shelke, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
...
AND
903 FIRST APPEAL NO. 1659 OF 2017

SATYABHAMA SHAHAJI MANE AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS
.....
Mr. Vivekanand V. Ingale, Advocate for Appellants.
Mr. D. R. Korde, AGP for Respondent-State.
Ms. Sunita D. Shelke, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
.....
AND
904 FIRST APPEAL NO. 1660 OF 2017

UMESH SHAHAJI MANE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS
.....
Mr. Vivekanand V. Ingale, Advocate for Appellant.
Mr. A. D. Wange, AGP for Respondent-State.
Ms. Sunita D. Shelke, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
.....

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 9th OCTOBER, 2026

P.C.:-

1. Since the acquisition proceedings pertain to the year 1997, the appeals are heard finally with the consent of the learned Advocates

for the respective parties.

2. By the present appeals, the Appellants/Claimants are challenging the judgment and award dated 06.10.2012 passed by the learned C.J.S.D, Omerga, District Osmanabad in LAR Nos.89/2008, 900/2005 and 991/2005, whereby the learned Reference Court refused to enhance the compensation to the extent claimed by the Appellants/Claimants.

3. Learned Advocate for the Appellants/Claimants submits that this Court has taken a view in First Appeal No.958 of 2013 along with connected matters decided on 03.08.2026 arising out of same acquisition proceeding i.e. for the purpose of construction of Bhikarsangvi Sathwan Talav at village Bedga.

4. Upon perusal of order passed by this Court in First Appeal No.958 of 2013 with connected matters, I am inclined to adopt the same view in the present appeals. Therefore, present appeals are disposed of accordingly. Hence, I proceed to pass the following order:-

O R D E R

(i) The appeals are partly allowed.

(ii) The Claimants are entitled to receive compensation at the rate of Rs.4400/- per R. for irrigated lands, Rs.3300/- per R. for semi-irrigated lands and Rs.2200/- per R. for dry lands, as per the categorisation made by the learned Reference Court.

(iii) The claimants shall be entitled to interest and other statutory benefits strictly in accordance with the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in the case of ***State of Maharashtra Vs. Kailash Shiva Rangari***, reported in ***2016(3) Mh.L.J. 457***..

(iv) The Claimants are not entitled to receive interest and statutory benefits for the delayed period.

(v) Appellants/Claimants shall pay the deficit court fees, if any, on enhanced amount.

(vi) The impugned judgments and awards are modified accordingly.

(vii) Rest of the award passed by the learned Reference Court remains unaltered.

(viii) Civil Applications, if any, stands disposed of.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)

Tauseef