

PETITIONER:
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

Vs.

RESPONDENT:
SITARAM SHIVHANDRAI GARODIA & ANR.

DATE OF JUDGMENT: 04/11/1996

BENCH:
K. RAMASWAMY, G.B. PATTANAIAK

ACT:

HEADNOTE:

JUDGMENT:

O R D E R

Leave granted.

We have heard learned counsel on both sides.

This appeal by special leave arises from the judgment of the Division Bench of the High Court of Bombay, dated August 11, 1994 made in W.P.No. 2705 of 1986.

It is not necessary to dilate upon all the facts concerning the case. Suffice it to state that the respondents have challenged the acquisition of part of the land in Survey No. 249 admeasuring 130 acres 19 Guntas which the respondent claims to have purchased. It would appear that in the affidavit filed by the Railway, they have given up the proposal for the acquisition of the land for Railway purpose. Under those circumstances, there is no necessity to proceed further with the acquisition. It is then contended by Shri F.S. Nariman, learned senior counsel appearing for the respondents, that in W.P.No. 1003 of 1982 titled Sitaram Shivchand Garodia & Anr. vs. S.V.Gokhale, the Assistant Salt Commissioner & Ors., the Division Bench of the High Court by order dated April 28, 1983 had allowed the writ petition setting aside the proceedings for summary eviction of them from the land in their occupation with liberty for the Union of India to file a suit to establish their title to the land. When S.L.P.(C) Nos. 8706 of 1984 & 11507-08 of 1983, against 1987, this Court refused to grant leave. The appellant's attempt to have respondent evicted from the lands stands concluded subject to the division in the suit. We are informed that though the appellants have filed Suit No. 670/87 on the original side of the High Court, it is contended that as per the cause title, it would appear that the respondents have not been impleaded as party-defendants. We need not go into the correctness thereof, since the respondents though ex-facie are shown to be not parties to the suit; even then, it would be open to the Government to take steps as may be available under law for impleading them as defendants, if not already impleaded, and in such eventuality it would be open to the respondents, to take such defence as is available.

The appeal is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

JUDIS