

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1467 OF 2026

Shreeji Investments LLP	...	Petitioner
Versus		
Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Settlement Authority at Aurangabad & Ors.	...	Respondents

Mr. Yogesh Naidu a/w Adv. Eden Ribeiro for the Petitioner.
Ms. Prachi Tatake, Addl. G. P. for Respondent Nos.1 and 3.
Mr. Rohit Gaikwad for Respondent No.2-BMC.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND
SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, JJ.
DATE : 2nd APRIL 2026**

P.C. :

. Heard Mr. Naidu, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. This petition reflects the plight of the petitioner as regards delay in disposal of reference proceeding by the respondent-Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Settlement Authority (LARR) under Section 64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'Act of 2013' for short). It is brought to our notice that the reference was instituted as far back as on 17th August 2022. Thereafter, on 15th November 2022, 'No WS' order was passed. But, subsequently, on 16th January 2023, the said order was set aside and an opportunity was granted to the respondents therein to file their written statement. The petitioner

seeking enhancement of compensation, filed an affidavit in lieu of evidence immediately thereafter, but we are informed that, till date, written statement has not been placed on record. The copy of the *Roznama* is tendered and the same is taken on record and marked 'X'. The *Roznama* shows that the proceedings before the LARR are languishing and date after date is allotted with no progress in the matter at all. The last date of the *Roznama* shows that proceedings was adjourned at the Pune camp of the LARR on 12th February 2026 for the next date of 12th March 2026.

3. We are informed that now the proceedings are adjourned to 9th April 2026, with no progress in the matter at all.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner relied upon judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of *Kolkata Municipal Corporation & Ors. vs. Bimal Kumar Shah & Ors.*, (2024) 10 SCC 533, to contend that such lack of progress in the reference proceeding eventually violates constitutional right to property under Article 300A of the Constitution of India, which has been recognized as a human right by the Supreme Court in a series of judgments.

5. We are informed that a single officer is appointed as the authority i.e. LARR for various regions of western Maharashtra and Konkan. The same officer moves between Nashik and Pune and at all these sittings in both the places, hundreds of such references are listed, as a consequence of which, there is virtually no progress in the matters.

6. Although, this petition only seeks a direction to LARR to dispose of the dispute/reference preferred by the petitioner, in a time bound manner, we find that unless a holistic solution is found, a direction issued in that regard by this Court may remain a hollow direction.

7. We are further informed that there are certain petitions pending in this Court raising this very issue, in which the learned Advocate General had appeared.

8. We also find that in the light of the directions we intend to issue in this petition, it would be appropriate that the State of Maharashtra, through the Department of Revenue, is added as a respondent in this petition. Leave is granted to the petitioner to add State of Maharashtra as a respondent and consequently, to amend the pleadings and grounds of the writ petition. The amendment be carried out within one week from today. Re-verification is dispensed with.

9. Issue notice, returnable on 29th April 2026, to be included in the supplementary list.

10. The learned AGP waives notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 3 as well as the newly added respondent-State of Maharashtra. Mr. Gaikwad, learned counsel waives notice on behalf of respondent No.2-Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai.

11. List Writ Petition No. 6330 of 2021 also on 29th April 2026,

along with this writ petition.

12. We request the Advocate General to appear in these writ petitions to assist this Court in passing appropriate directions in these matters.

(SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)