
(2010) 10 BOM CK 0105

In the Bombay High Court

Case No : Civil Revision Application No. 127 of 2010

Appasheb Chede

APPELLANT

Vs

The State of Maharashtra

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 28-10-2010

Acts Referred:

Land Acquisition Act, 1894 — Section 4

Citation : (2012) 1 BomCR 458 : (2011) 3 MhLj 208

Hon'ble Judges : S.S. Shinde, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : A.N. Nagargoje, for the Appellant; V.H. Dighe, A.G.P., for the Respondent

Judgement

S.S. Shinde, J.—Heard counsel for the parties.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. By consent of the parties, heard finally.

3. This Revision application is filed being aggrieved by the order dated 19.8.2009, passed by learned Joint Civil Judge, Senior Division, Osmanabad in L.A.R. No. 636 of 2000, thereby dismissing Land Acquisition Reference filed by the petitioner.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that the land bearing gat No. 489/A and 488 /B situated at village Washi, Tq. Washi, District Osmanabad belonging to the petitioner have been acquired by the respondent authorities for the purpose of construction of percolation tank at village Washi. The Land Acquisition Officer has published notice u/s 4 of the Land Acquisition Act on 24.3.1994.

5. Being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer thereby granting inadequate compensation @ Rs. 12,500/- per acre, the petitioner had preferred Land Acquisition Reference bearing No. 636 of 2000 before the learned Joint C.J.S.D. Osmanabad. However, on 19.8.2009 the learned C.J.S.D. Osmanabad dismissed the petitioner's Reference petition on the ground that the petitioner has not led any evidence to show that the

compensation granted by the S.L.A.O. is inadequate. Hence, this Revision.

6. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the order passed by learned Judge is without giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and therefore, the order impugned is against the principles of natural justice. It is further submitted that the Court below should not have dismissed the reference, merely on technicalities. It is further submitted that the Land Acquisition Reference, ought to have been decided on merits. The learned Counsel appearing for the revision petitioner, invited my attention to the grounds in the Civil Revision Application, and submitted that the impugned Judgment and Order deserves to be set aside. In support of his contention, the learned Counsel for the revision petitioner, placed reliance on the reported Judgment of this Court, in case of *Kawadu Bansod Vs. State of Maharashtra and Another*, . Relying on the said Judgment the learned Counsel appearing for the revision petitioner, would urge that the facts of the case in hand and the facts of the case which is cited *supra* are similar. In the said case this Court has taken a view that the reference cannot be rejected, only for the reason that the revision petitioner has failed to adduce any evidence. The learned Counsel appearing for the revision petitioner, invited my attention to para No. 7 of the said judgment and submitted that in the interest of justice, the impugned Judgment and Order deserves to be set aside.

7. On the other hand, learned A.G.P. has justified the impugned judgment and order on the ground that the same cannot be faulted with any error and prayed for dismissal of the Revision.

8. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the parties at length.

In my view, the impugned Judgment and Order deserves to be interfered with and required to be quashed and set aside.

At the outset, it has to be clarified that the present Civil Revision Application is maintainable, in view of the law laid down by this Court in the case of *Kawadu Madhav Bansod (supra)*, as the facts involved in the instant case are similar to the facts of that case.

9. Coming to the first contention of the Counsel appearing for the revision petitioner that Land Acquisition Reference should not have been rejected, on the ground of not filing documentary evidence is concerned, this Court in case of *Kawadu Madha v. Bansod (supra)*, has taken a view that the said order rejecting the reference on the ground of failure of the revision petitioner to adduce evidence cannot be taken to be adjudicated, and therefore, same cannot be treated to be an Award. Therefore, the ground i.e. no documentary evidence is filed by the revision petitioner, cannot be a ground to reject the reference. This Court in the aforesaid case in para No. 7 has observed thus:

It is true that the adjudication made by the Civil Court on the reference has to be regarded as an award, whether an enhanced compensation is given or not. But in that event the Court should consider the material on record, even if the party is

absent and has failed to adduce evidence. Unless the material on record is considered the order cannot be said to be an adjudication. In the instant case the ground given for the dismissal of reference by the Civil Court is that the applicant (present revision petitioner) remained absent and did not adduce any evidence to show that a proper compensation was not paid to him and that he is entitled to more compensation than paid. The above order clearly shows that the reference was dismissed only for the reason of failure of the applicant (present revision petitioner) to adduce evidence. Thus the material on record is not considered by the Civil Court. It is not considered as to how the compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer was correct. So the order cannot be taken to be an adjudication and therefore the same cannot be treated to be an award. The order passed by the Civil Judge, Senior Division, Yavatmal also cannot be treated to be a dismissal of the reference in default. The learned Counsel for revision petitioner submitted that the case could not be dismissed in default also.

(Emphasis supplied).

Therefore, in my opinion, the Court below should not have rejected the reference, on the ground of failure of the revision petitioner to adduce evidence.

Yet in another unreported Judgment in the case of Shri Kamalkar S/o Laxman Suryawanshi v. State of Maharashtra in Civil Revision Application No. 1965 of 2005 and in other two connected matters, this Court has taken a similar view. Therefore, I have no hesitation, to hold that the reference filed by the revision petitioner, should not have been dismissed, merely on the ground of failure of the revision petitioner to adduce evidence.

10. I have given due consideration to the submissions, advanced by the Counsel for the revision petitioner and I find considerable force in his arguments. Therefore, in my opinion, the claim of the revision petitioner should not have been discarded/rejected, merely on technicalities of not adducing documentary evidence. The Court below, should have given sufficient and full opportunity to the revision petitioner to put-forth his case, and after appreciating his contentions at length, the reference should have been decided.

11. In the result, the impugned Judgment and Order dated 19.08.2009, passed by the learned Civil Judge (S.D.) Osmanabad, District Osmanabad, in Land Acquisition Reference No. 636 of 2000 is quashed and set aside and the matter is remitted back to the learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Osmanabad.

12. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner makes a statement before this Court that from the first date of hearing fixed by the Reference court, the petitioner herein will file necessary documents and complete the evidence within two months from the first date. The Reference Court, upon recording evidence and hearing arguments, shall dispose of the L.A.R. No. 636 of 2000 within two months thereafter.

13. The Registry to send back the record and proceeding, if any, immediately to the concerned Court. Rule made absolute in the above terms. The Civil Revision Application is disposed of.