



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

926 WRIT PETITION NO. 3373 OF 2026

Arun Brijalal Chaudhari

VERSUS

The Union Of India Through Deputy Secretary And Others

...

Ms. Sakshi Kale h/for Mr. Jindal Divyanshu Shailesh, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for the Respondent State

Mr. U. B. Bondar, Advocate for respondent Nos. 1 and 3

Mr. D. S. Manorkar, Advocate for Respondent No.4

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
NEERAJ P. DHOTE, JJ.

Dated : 16th April, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. The present petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

"(B)That, it may kindly be hold and declare that, the act of
Competent Authority / Arbitrator itself is illegal and violative for
the reason that once law laid down by Hon'ble Supreme Court
and issue has been settled in the matter of Union of India V/s
Tarsem Singh, then Arbitrator or Authorities has no right or
reason to deny the benefit to petitioners.

(B) By issuing appropriate writ, order or direction in the like nature,
respondents may kindly be direct to the respondent authorities
to grant statutory benefits to the petitioners as per law laid
down by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of Union of India
v/s Tarsem Singh in respect of 30% solatium and 15% interest."

2. The learned Advocate Ms. Sakshi Kale holding for Mr.
Divyanshu Jindal, Advocate for the Petitioner, submits that she is not

pressing prayer Clause (B) and would go ahead with prayer Clause (C). She submits that the representation by the petitioner was made to the competent authority on 14.11.2025 (Exh.B page 23), which was to be decided in view of **Union of India & Another Vs. Tarsem Singh & Others, (2019) 9 SCC 304**. She then states that Respondent No.4 had filed Review Petition before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and that has also been decided.

3. Learned Advocate Mr. Bondar appears for Respondent Nos. 1 and 3. Learned AGP waives for Respondent No.2. Learned Advocate Mr. Manorkar waives for Respondent No.4. The learned Advocate Mr. Bondar submits that the said representation would be decided in view of Paragraph No. 14(ii) of the decision in Review Petition(Civil) No. 2528/2025, **National Highways Authority of India Vs. Tarsem Singh and others**, decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 25.03.2026.

4. We are not going much into the other details. Certainly, the Review Petition was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court and it has been decided at that Court. The claims those are made in respect of solatium and interest will have to be decided on the basis of the decision by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. The learned Advocate representing Respondent No.3-the competent authority, upon instructions, makes statement that the representation dated 14.11.2025 would be decided within a period of

10 weeks. He submits that the calculations would be made within a period of 10 weeks and would inform it to Respondent No.4.

6. In view of the said statement, we dispose of the Writ Petition by directing Respondent No.3 to decide the representation dated 14.11.2025 within a period of 10 weeks from today and to communicate the said calculation, in proper format, to Respondent No.4 within a period of one week after taking such decision. Respondent No.4 then to make payment as per the calculation within period of four weeks after the calculation is submitted by respondent no.3.

7. If at all the calculation is not agreeable, then the proper procedure prescribed under the law may be utilized by Respondent No. 4 as well as the petitioner.

(NEERAJ P. DHOTE, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI J.)