

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4891 OF 2026

Dhanraj Baburao Kothule And Ors .. Petitioners

V/S.

The State Of Maharashtra Thr its .. Respondents
Principal Secretary And Ors

Mr. Amay Deshpande with Harsh Nishar h/f Niyati Sontakke, for
Petitioners.

Ms. Pooja Patil, AGP, for Respondent/State.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.**

DATE : 15TH JUNE 2026.

PC:

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and learned AGP for the Respondent/State.
2. The grievance of the Petitioners in this petition appears to be that they were not granted a meaningful hearing on their objections during the process of acquisition of the subject land.
3. A copy of the award dated 03/02/2026 is on record. It shows that public notice inviting objections was issued on 23/12/2025. In response thereto, the petitioners appear to have submitted their objections on various dates in January 2026.
4. The stated case of the petitioners is that while they were heard

on their objections on 02/02/2026, immediately thereafter, on 03/02/2026, the award was passed. On this basis, it was submitted that an effective hearing was not granted, and on this ground itself, this Court may consider quashing the aforesaid award dated 03/02/2026.

5. We find substance in the contention of the learned AGP that since the aforesaid public notice inviting objections was issued on 23/12/2025 and as per the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, a period of 30 days was mandatorily required to lapse before further steps were taken towards issuance of the land acquisition award and that in the present case the said requirement was indeed complied with, it cannot be said that the process was rendered illegal in any manner.

6. We are unable to agree with the petitioners that merely because the impugned award was passed a day after hearing was afforded to the petitioners, it ought to be presumed that an effective hearing was not granted.

7. It appears that the essential grievance of the petitioners pertains to the valuation and, hence, quantum of compensation awarded in the impugned award. If that be so, a statutory remedy under Section 64 of the aforesaid Act is available to the petitioners. Nothing prevents the petitioners from availing of the said remedy in accordance with law.

8. In view of the above, the Writ Petition is dismissed. However, the petitioners are at liberty to avail of the aforesaid statutory remedy

under Section 64 of the said Act, in accordance with law. In that context, all rights and contentions of the parties are kept open.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)