



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

39 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1173 OF 2024
WITH
RAST/38602/2023

THE MAHARASHTRA KRISHNA VALLEY DEVELOPMENT
CORPORATION, THROUGH THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
OSMANABAD

VERSUS

RAMESH VITHALRAO PATIL DIED LRS RUPA RAMESH PATIL
AND ORS

...

Advocate for Applicant :

Mr. P. R. Katneshwarkar, Senior Advocate i/b. Mr. Tambe Rahul A

AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. B. V. Virdhe

Advocate for Respondents No.2 to 5 : Mr. Patil Vijay B.

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

DATE : 27.04.2026

PER COURT:

1. Heard.
2. The Applicant has placed on record additional affidavit.
3. The present review application is filed seeking review of the final order dated 07.02.2020 in Civil Application No.1458 of 2020, passed by this court. It is stated that the said order dated 07.02.2020 was challenged before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in SLP (Civil) Diary No.(s).40750 of 2022. The Hon'ble Supreme

Court by order dated 27.02.2023 dismissed the SLP on the ground of delay. Relevant portion of the SLP order is noted below:

"**ORDER**
SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s).
40750/2022

Permission to file SLP is granted.

We note that in the instant petition, there is an inordinate delay of 2183 days in filing the petition. The explanation sought to be put forth is that the State Government was earlier concerned with the acquisition, and the petitioner has taken steps to challenge the judgment of the High Court only after the different Irrigation Corporations were formed and the petitioner undertook the work for which the acquisition was made.

Such explanation for an inordinate delay of the present nature cannot be accepted since, if prior to the formation of Irrigation Corporations, the acquiring authority was of the opinion that the market value determined is excessive, whichever the authority which was dealing with the matter at that point in time was required to take steps to assail the judgment. Having not done so, it would not be open for the petitioner to put forth such contention. Further, the compensation amount is also stated to have been paid.

In that view of the matter, we see no reason to condone the inordinate delay. The petition is accordingly, dismissed on the ground of delay."

4. After dismissal of the SLP, the present Review Application is filed. The grounds given for the delay are similar to the grounds given in the application for condonation of delay in filing the SLP.

5. Considering that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has dismissed the SLP on the ground of enormous delay of 2183 days

and the grounds taken in the present application are similar to the grounds taken before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this court would not entertain the Review Application and dismiss the delay condonation application of 2530 days delay.

6. Considering the same, the application for condonation of delay in filing the Review Application is dismissed. Accordingly, the Review Application is also dismissed.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe