



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.5044 OF 2026

IN WP/1939/2026

The State of Maharashtra and others

Versus

Rambhau Shankar Satpute

...

Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Applicants/State.

Mr. Shashikant E. Shekade, Advocate for the respondent.

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 28 APRIL 2026

ORDER :

. Civil Application No.5044 of 2026 has been filed for following reliefs :-

“B) The order dated 09th April, 2026 in Writ Petition No.1939 of 2026 may kindly be modified similar to the order dated 8th April, 2026 in Writ Petition No.1985 of 2026 as per undertaking given by the applicant No.3 dated 9th April, 2026.

C) The time period to deposit an amount of Rs.21,80,148/- as per undertaking dated 9th April, 2026

may kindly be extended by further period of 15 working days from today.”

2. Heard learned AGP and learned Advocate Mr. S. E. Shekade for respondent.

3. In fact, we are taking objection to the fact that petitioner Nos.2 and 3 have not been made as party respondents to the application when modification is sought in respect of the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.1939 of 2026. Office had taken the objection to that effect, however, the objection has not been removed.

4. For whatever the reasons that has been stated in the application, we were not going into the aspects. The sole intention of directing the respondents to deposit the amount of Rs.21,80,148/- was that the petitioners should get the amount. However, according to the respondent, in respect of petitioner No.1 amount of Rs.31,165/-, in respect of petitioner No.2 amount of Rs.84,896/- and in respect of petitioner No.3 amount of Rs.53,427/- is towards Section 80 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and the cheques were ready in that respect on 07.04.2026, however, since in the order, there was no mention about the undertaking those cheques were not deposited. We are absolutely not convinced with

the reason given for not depositing the amount, however, since the petitioners should get something, we direct the office to accept the cheques of Rs.31,165/- in respect of petitioner No.1, Rs.84,896/- in respect of petitioner No.2 and Rs.53,427/- in respect of petitioner No.3 dated 07.04.2026 today itself.

5. Now, the calculation has been given which is in respect of the rental compensation which is then stated to be Rs.21,80,148/-, which is in respect of in all four persons. In respect of petitioner No.1, it is stated to be amount of RS.3,40,436/-, in respect of petitioner No.2 it is Rs.9,27,394/- and for petitioner No.4 it is Rs.5,83,622/-. We direct respondent No.2 to deposit the said amount or cause it to be deposited through the acquiring body on or before 11.06.2026.

6. We are making it clear that we are not going into the calculation and decide as to whether the claim of the petitioner is correct or the claim of the respondents is correct. That would be decided at a later stage and when the deadline is given, respondent No.2 should see that the said amount is deposited. This will not consider the request that only the demand has been made and the acquiring body is yet to respond. Respondent No.2 may recover the said amount which would be deposited by it from the acquiring body at a later point of time.

7. Place the matter for consideration on 19.06.2026 and office to accept the cheques which are in the personal names of petitioners and hand it over to them after verifying identity.
8. Accordingly, civil application stands disposed of.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm