

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

WEDNESDAY, THE 25TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/6TH PHALGUNA, 1936

WP(C).No.33729 of 2010 (M)

PETITIONERS:

1. K.ANIL KUMAR,SREEVILASAM,SAI VIHAR,
VALATHUNGAL P.O.,KOLLAM.
2. LALITHA,CHECKALAKONATHU VEEDU,
PATTATHANAM P.O.,KOLLAM-691021
3. HASEENA,NIZAM MANZIL,KILIKKOLLOOR P.O.,
KOLLAM
4. GEETHA B,T.C.9/198,JAWAHAR NAHAR,
SASTHAMANGALAM,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.
5. PAUL.C.,REJA COTTAGE,VIDHAYA NAGAR,
MANAGAD P.O, KOLLAM

**BY ADVS.SRI.S.SANTHOSH KUMAR
SMT.P.LISSY JOSE.**

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE STATE OF KERALA, REP.BY THE
SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
SECRETARIAT,THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-695001
2. THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
LOCAL SELF GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT,SECRETARIAT,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,PIN-695001
3. THE COMMISSIONER OF LAND REVENUE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM,PIN-695001
4. THE DISTRICT COLLECTOR,KOLLAM,PIN-691001
5. THE SPECIAL TAHSILDAR,L.A.NO.2-KOLLAM,
KUNDARA,KOLLAM,PIN-691006
6. THE CORPORATION OF KOLLAM,
REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY,
PIN-691001.

**R1 TO R5 BY SENIOR GOVT. PLEADER SRI.P.K.ABDUL RAHMAN.
R6 BY SRI.M.K.CHANDRA MOHAN DAS,SC,**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD
ON 25-02-2015, ALONG WITH WP(C).29746/2010 AND CONNECTED CASES
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS:

EXT.P1:TRUE COPIES OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPTS DATED 26.6.2009,10.8.009 & 14.10.2009, ISSUED TO THE 1ST PETITIONER.

EXT.P1(a):TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPTS DATED 26.6.2009 & 14.10.2009, ISSUED TO THE 2ND PETITIONER.

EXT.P1(b):TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 29.4.2010, ISSUED TO THE 3RD PETITIONER.

EXT.P1(c):TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 14.10.2010 ISSUED TO THE 4TH PETITIONER.

EXT.P1(d):TRUE COPY OF THE LAND TAX RECEIPT DATED 10.5.2010 ISSUED TO THE 5TH PETITIONER.

EXT.P2:TRUE COPY OF THE IDENTITY CARD ALONG WITH AGREEMENT AND BUILDING PERMIT DATED 24.4.2010 OF THE 5TH PETITIONER.

EXT.P2(a):TRUE COPY OF THE BUILDING PERMIT DATED 16.7.2010 ISSUED TO 1ST PETITIONER.

EXT.P2(b):TRUE COPY OF THE BUILDING PERMIT DATED 5.8.2010 ISSUED TO THE 3RD PETITIONER.

EXT.P3:TRUE COPY OF THE RESOLUTION DATED 22.3.2008 OF THE 6TH RESPONDENT.

EXT.P4:TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 29.3.2008 OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT.

EXT.P5:TRUE COPY OF THE LETTER DATED 12.10.2009 OF THE 4TH RESPONDENT.

EXT.P6:TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 20.2.2010 OF THE 3RD RESPONDENT.

EXT.P7:TRUE COPY OF THE NOTIFICATION DATED 13.4.2010.

EXT.P8:TRUE COPY OF THE VALUATION REPORT DATED 16.10.2009,OF THE PROPERTY OF THE 1ST PETITIONER.

EXT.P9:TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 8.10.2010.

EXT.P9(a):TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 5.10.2010.

EXT.P10:TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 21.10.2010 IN W.P(C) NO.323122010.

EXT.P10(a):TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 6.10.2010 IN W.P(C) NO.29746/2010.

RESPONDENT'S EXHIBITS:

NIL
//TRUE COPY//

A.M. Shaffique, J.

=====

W.P (C) Nos. 33729, 29746,
32312 and 33727 of 2010

=====

Dated this, the 25th day of February, 2015.

J U D G M E N T

Petitioners challenge a notification issued under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, inter alia contending that there is no necessity for invoking urgency clause under Section 17(4) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. For easy reference, I am relying upon the documents in W.P (C) No. 33729/2010.

2. The facts involved in W.P (C) No. 33729/2010 would disclose that an attempt had been made by the Corporation of Kollam to acquire certain item of land for public purpose. Though a decision has been taken much earlier and the Government had approved acquisition of land as per Government Order dated 29.3.2008 invoking urgency clause under Section 17(4), notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act was issued only as per Ext. P7 dated 13.4.2010.

3. The main contention urged is that the dispensation of an enquiry under Section 5A of the Act was unwarranted on account of the fact that there was delay between the date of Government Order Ext. P3 and the date of notification under Section 4(1).

4. Counter affidavit has been filed by respondents 4

and 5 indicating the necessity for invoking urgency clause under Section 17(4) of the Act.

5. Other writ petitions are also filed seeking similar reliefs with reference to very same acquisition.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners relied upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Prabhawati & Others v. State of Bihar & Others**, (2014) 13 SCC 721 to contend that on account of long lapse of time and notification under Section 17(4), the notification is required to be quashed.

7. The questions to be considered in these writ petitions whether (a) notification 17(4) is required to be quashed and (b) whether the writ petitioners are to be heard under Section 5A of the Act before orders are passed.

8. As far as the notification is concerned, it is well settled by judgment of the Supreme Court that unless there are special circumstances by which land is required to be acquired on an urgent basis, Section 5A enquiry shall not be dispensed with. It is evident from the facts available in the case that though Corporation of Kollam had requested for acquisition of land on urgent basis, Government issued 4(1)

notification only after 2 years. Under such circumstances, invoking urgency clause under Section 17(4) is clearly bad in law since land owners/holders were not granted an opportunity to submit their objection under Section 5A.

9. Under such circumstances, I am of the view that the notification to the extent that it does not provide opportunity for hearing under Section 5A has to be set aside. Accordingly, I do so.

10. In **Prabhawati's case** (supra), the notification was issued after 15 years before the date of decision, which will not apply to the facts of the preset case. In the present case, further proceedings were stayed by interim orders. Hence, the request for quashing the entire notification is declined.

11. The learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that in respect of certain persons who had not challenged the notification, it seems that the notification had already been lapsed. If no steps had been taken for passing an award pursuant to the notification under Section 4(1) in respect of other land holders whose land had already been notified under the same notification, the petitioners are also entitled for

the same benefit and the notification shall be deemed to have lapsed.

12. In the said circumstances, the writ petitions are disposed of as under:

If the notification under Section 4(1) has not lapsed as stated above, it is open for the land acquisition authorities to proceed further after giving an opportunity to the petitioners to submit their objections under Section 5A of the Land Acquisition Act and thereafter necessary proceedings shall be taken in accordance with the procedure prescribed.

Sd/-

A.M. Shaffique, Judge.

Tds/