

\$~26

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

% *Date of Judgment: 28th November, 2017*

+ W.P.(C) 2297/2016

VIKRAM SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms.Deepika V. Marwaha, Mr.Vinay
K.Shailendra and Ms.Worthing Kasar,
Advocates

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF
DELHI & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Yeeshu Jain, Standing counsel for
LAC/L&B with Ms.Jyoti Tyagi, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.S.SISTANI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.KAMESWAR RAO

G.S.SISTANI, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner. The petitioner seeks a declaration that the acquisition proceedings with respect to the land of the petitioner measuring 1 bigha and 6 biswas out of 16 bighas and 4 biswas (being 27/72 shares in 43 bighas and 4 biswas) falling in Khasra nos. 1269 (4-16), 1272 (4-16), 1273 (4-16), 1284 (4-16), 1285 (4-16), 1286 (4-16), 1287 (4-16) 1288(4-16), 1292 (4-16) having possession of land in Khasra no. 1269 (4-16), situated in the revenue estate of village Malikpur Kohi @ Rangpuri, New Delhi-110070(hereinafter referred to as the "subject land") would stand lapsed in view 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 New Act”).

2. Ms. Marwaha submits that a notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the Act’) was issued on 27th June, 1996. A notification under Section 6 of the Act was issued on 10.01.1997. Thereafter, an Award no.2/1998-99 was made on 07.01.1999.
3. The learned counsel submits that paper possession was taken with respect to a part of the land. However, the actual physical possession of the entire area continues to remain with the petitioner, besides no compensation has been paid. Learned counsel relies on the para 5 of the counter affidavit filed by the LAC in support of her submission that neither compensation has been paid nor possession has been taken.
4. The learned counsel for the LAC submits that the possession of the land has been taken, however, the compensation has not been paid. He submits that the physical possession could not be taken on account of stay having been granted in various petitions.
5. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties.
6. We deem it appropriate to reproduce Para 5 of the counter affidavit, which reflects the stand taken by the LAC, as under:

“5. That as per record the status of the land of the petitioner mention in the writ petition is detail as below:

Khasra No.	Notification u/s 4 of LA Act	Notification u/s 6 of LA Act	Award No.	Date of possession	Details of compensation	Stay in Delhi High Court
1269 (4-16),	F.9(12)/95/L&b/LA/9743 Dated 27/06/96	F.9(12)/95/L&b/LA/1046 Dated 10/01/97	02/98-99 village Rangpur i Dated 07/01/99	Possession not Taken	Not received from requisitioning Department. Hence not paid.	Kh. No. 1269(4-16) stay vide WPC No. 4431/15, 1607/16, 1703/16, 1679/16.
1284 (4-16), 1285 (4-16), 1286(4-16), 1287(4-16)	Do	Do	Do	Possession not taken	Not received from requisitioning department. Hence not paid.	Kh. No. 1287 (4-16), 1284 (4-16), 1285(4-16), 1286 (4-16), stay vide WPC No. 4431/15, 1568/16, 1607/16, 1703/16 & 1679/16.
1288(4-16)	Do	Do	Do	Possession not taken	Not received from requisitioning department. Hence not paid.	Kh. No. 1288 stay vide WPC No. 1609/16, 4431/15, 1607/16, 1568/16, 1679/16.
1292 (4-16)	Do	Do	Do	Possession not taken	Not received from requisitioning department. Hence not paid.	Kh. No. 1292 (4-16) stay vide WPC No. 4431/15, 1607/16, 1703/16, 1679/16, 1568/15, 1607/16 & 1703/16.
1272 (4-16) & 1273 (4-16)	Do	Do	Do	Possession taken on 31/12/13	Do	-

7. A careful reading of para 5 would show the details with regard to issuing notifications, Award number and the endorsement regarding possession not having taken for the reasons stated therein have been

reflected. The counter affidavit also shows that the amount of compensation was not tendered as the compensation was not received from the requisitioning department.

8. The case of the petitioner is fully covered by the decision rendered by the Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki & ors.***, reported at (2014) 3 SCC 183. Paras 14 to 20 read as under:

“14. Section 31(1) of the 1894 Act enjoins upon the Collector, on making an award under Section 11, to tender payment of compensation to persons interested entitled thereto according to award. It further mandates the Collector to make payment of compensation to them unless prevented by one of the contingencies contemplated in sub-section (2). The contingencies contemplated in Section 31(2) are: (i) the persons interested entitled to compensation do not consent to receive it (ii) there is no person competent to alienate the land and (iii) there is dispute as to the title to receive compensation or as to the apportionment of it. If due to any of the contingencies contemplated in Section 31(2), the Collector is prevented from making payment of compensation to the persons interested who are entitled to compensation, then the Collector is required to deposit the compensation in the court to which reference under Section 18 may be made.

15. Simply put, Section 31 of the 1894 Act makes provision for payment of compensation or deposit of the same in the court. This provision requires that the Collector should tender payment of compensation as awarded by him to the persons interested who are entitled to compensation. If due to happening of any contingency as contemplated in Section 31(2), the compensation has not been paid, the Collector should deposit the amount of compensation in the court to which reference can be made under Section 18.

16. The mandatory nature of the provision in Section 31(2) with regard to deposit of the compensation in the court is further fortified by the provisions contained in Sections 32, 33 and 34. As a matter of fact, Section 33 gives power to the court, on an application by a person interested or claiming an interest in such money, to pass an order to invest the amount so deposited in such government or other approved securities and may direct the interest or other proceeds of any such investment to be accumulated and paid in such manner as it may consider proper so that the parties interested therein may have the benefit therefrom as they might have had from the land in respect whereof such money shall have been deposited or as near thereto as may be.

17. While enacting Section 24(2), Parliament definitely had in its view Section 31 of the 1894 Act. From that one thing is clear that it did not intend to equate the word “paid” to “offered” or “tendered”. But at the same time, we do not think that by use of the word “paid”, Parliament intended receipt of compensation by the landowners/persons interested. In our view, it is not appropriate to give a literal construction to the expression “paid” used in this sub-section (sub-section (2) of Section 24). If a literal construction were to be given, then it would amount to ignoring procedure, mode and manner of deposit provided in Section 31(2) of the 1894 Act in the event of happening of any of the contingencies contemplated therein which may prevent the Collector from making actual payment of compensation. We are of the view, therefore, that for the purposes of Section 24(2), the compensation shall be regarded as “paid” if the compensation has been offered to the person interested and such compensation has been deposited in the court where reference under Section 18 can be made on happening of any of the contingencies contemplated under Section 31(2) of the 1894 Act. In other words, the compensation may be said to have been “paid” within the meaning of Section 24(2) when the Collector (or for that matter Land Acquisition Officer) has discharged his

obligation and deposited the amount of compensation in court and made that amount available to the interested person to be dealt with as provided in Sections 32 and 33.

18. 1894 Act being an expropriatory legislation has to be strictly followed. The procedure, mode and manner for payment of compensation are prescribed in Part V (Sections 31-34) of the 1894 Act. The Collector, with regard to the payment of compensation, can only act in the manner so provided. It is settled proposition of law (classic statement of Lord Roche in *Nazir Ahmad*[1]) that where a power is given to do a certain thing in a certain way, the thing must be done in that way or not at all. Other methods of performance are necessarily forbidden.

19. Now, this is admitted position that award was made on 31.01.2008. Notices were issued to the landowners to receive the compensation and since they did not receive the compensation, the amount (Rs.27 crores) was deposited in the government treasury. Can it be said that deposit of the amount of compensation in the government treasury is equivalent to the amount of compensation paid to the landowners/persons interested? We do not think so. In a comparatively recent decision, this Court in *Agnelo Santimano Fernandes*[2], relying upon the earlier decision in *Prem Nath Kapur*[3], has held that the deposit of the amount of the compensation in the state's revenue account is of no avail and the liability of the state to pay interest subsists till the amount has not been deposited in court.

20. From the above, it is clear that the award pertaining to the subject land has been made by the Special Land Acquisition Officer more than five years prior to the commencement of the 2013 Act. It is also admitted position that compensation so awarded has neither been paid to the landowners/persons interested nor deposited in the court. The deposit of compensation amount in the government treasury is of no avail and cannot be held to be equivalent to compensation paid to the landowners/persons interested. We

have, therefore, no hesitation in holding that the subject land acquisition proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act.”

9. In view of the submissions made and the stand taken by the LAC in their counter affidavit, we are of the considered view that the necessary ingredients for the application of Section 24(2) of the New Act as has been interpreted by the Supreme Court of India and this Court in the following cases stand satisfied:

- (1) ***Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki & ors.***, reported at (2014) 3 SCC 183;
- (2) **Union of India and Ors v. Shiv Raj and Ors.**, reported at (2014) 6 SCC 564;
- (3) **Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Association v. State of Tamil Nadu and Ors**, Civil Appeal no.8700/2013 decided on 10.09.2014;
- (4) **Surender Singh v. Union of India & Others**, W.P.(C).2294/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court; and
- (5) **Girish Chhabra v. Lt. Governor of Delhi and Ors**; W.P.(C).2759/2014 decided on 12.09.2014 by this Court.

10. In view of the discussion above, the petitioner is entitled to a declaration that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 with regard to the subject land are deemed to have lapsed. It is so declared.

11. The writ petition stands disposed of.

CM.APPL 9909/2016(stay)

12. The interim order dated 02.05.2016 is confirmed.

G.S.SISTANI, J.

V.KAMESWAR RAO, J.

NOVEMBER 28, 2017/rb