

\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

% Judgment delivered on: 14.07.2015

+ **WP(C) No.2615/2015 and CM 4676/2015**

RAJESH KUMAR Petitioner

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr Sumit Bansal, Advocate.

For the Respondent No.1 : Mr Prashanta Verma and Mr Santosh Kumar Pandey

For the Respondent No.2 : Mr Yeeshu Jain with Ms Jyoti Tyagi, Advocates For the

For the Respondent No.3 : Ms Shobhana Takiar

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE BADAR DURREZ AHMED

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J (ORAL)

1. The counter affidavit handed over by Mr Yeeshu Jain on behalf of respondent No.2 is taken on record. The learned counsel for the petitioner does not wish to file any rejoinder affidavit inasmuch as he would be relying on the averments made in the writ petition.

2. The petitioner seeks the benefit of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 2013 Act') which came into effect on 01.01.2014. A declaration is sought to the

effect that the acquisition proceeding initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as 'the 1894 Act') in respect of which Award No. 14/1987-88 dated 26.05.1987 was made, *inter alia*, in respect of the petitioner's 1/10th share in the land comprised in Khasra Nos.130/2(2-16), 162(0-2), 163(0-7) and 169(0-2) measuring 3 bighas and 7 biswas (to the extent of 1/10th share), in village Satbari, Delhi, shall be deemed to have lapsed.

3. Insofar as Khasra Nos.162, 163 and 169 are concerned, it is admitted by the respondents that the physical possession of the same could not be taken. As regards the other Khasra No.130/2, the stand of the respondents is that physical possession of the said land was taken on 14.07.1987. This is disputed by the petitioner, who claims to be in actual physical possession of the entire subject land.

4. In so far as the question of compensation is concerned, the same has not been paid to the petitioner but according to the respondents, the same has been deposited in the treasury. Therefore, they seek to invoke the second Proviso to Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, which was introduced by virtue of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency

in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Ordinance, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as “the said Ordinance”).

5. So far as the applicability of the second Proviso to Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act is concerned, the same cannot be relied upon by the respondents inasmuch as the said Ordinance has been held to be prospective in nature and does not take away vested rights. This has so been held by the Supreme Court in recent decision in **M/s Radiance Fincap (P) Ltd. & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Ors.** decided on **12.01.2015 in Civil Appeal No. 4283/2011** wherein the Supreme Court held as under:-

“The right conferred to the land holders/owners of the acquired land under Section 24(2) of the Act is the statutory right and, therefore, the said right cannot be taken away by an Ordinance by inserting proviso to the abovesaid sub-section without giving retrospective effect to the same.”

6. The same has been reinforced by the Supreme Court in **Karnail Kaur & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Ors.** Civil Appeal No. 7424/2013 decided on **22.01.2015**.

7. From the above decisions, it is evident that the said Ordinance is prospective in nature and the rights created in favour of the petitioner as

on 01.01.2014 by virtue of the 2013 Act are undisturbed by the second Proviso to Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, which has been introduced by the said Ordinance. The same would be the position with regard to the Ordinance of 2015.

8. Without going into the controversy with regard to the physical possession in so far as the three Khasra Nos. are concerned, this much is clear that the Award was made more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act and the compensation has also not been paid to the petitioner, but has only been deposited in the treasury, which does not amount to payment of compensation as interpreted by the Supreme Court in **Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Ors**: (2014) 3 SCC 183.

9. All the necessary ingredients for the application of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act as interpreted by the Supreme Court and this Court in the following cases stand satisfied:-

- (1) **Union of India and Ors v. Shiv Raj and Ors**: (2014) 6 SCC 564;
- (2) **Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Ors**: Civil Appeal No. 8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;

- (3) **Surender Singh v. Union of India & Others: WP(C) 2294/2014** decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court; and
- (4) **Girish Chhabra v. Lt. Governor of Delhi and Ors: WP(C) 2759/2014** decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court.

10. As a result, the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the said acquisition proceedings initiated under the 1894 Act in respect of the subject land are deemed to have lapsed. It is so declared.

11. The writ petition is allowed to the aforesaid extent. There shall be no order as to costs.

BADAR DURREZ AHMED, J

JULY14, 2015
‘sn’

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J