

AD- 45-54
30.04.2025
(AK)

FAT/310/2016
IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
SAIL (ISP), BURNPUR, SAIL, IISCO STEEL PLANT,
BURNPUR
VS
BISWANATH MAJHI & ANR
With
FAT/157/2019
IA No: CAN 1 of 2025
SAIL (ISP) BURNPUR STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA
LTD.
VS
LAKSHMAN CH. MAJHI & ANR.
with
FAT/158/2019
IA No: CAN 1 of 2025
SR. MGR., ESTATE STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA
LTD.
VS
KAPIL MAJI @ KAPIL CH. MAJHI & ANR.
with
FAT/161/2019
IA No: IA No: CAN 1 of 2019
(Old No: CAN 4004 of 2019)
CAN 2 of 2025
D.GM. SAIL
VS
JIBANKRISHAN MAJI & ANR.
with
FAT/206/2017
IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
SAIL(ISP), BURNPUR, STEEL AUTHORITY OF
INDIA LIMITED, IISCO
VS
BISWANATH MAJHI & ANR
with
FAT/496/2016
IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
SAIL (ISP) BURNPUR, IISCO STEEL PLANT
BURNPUR
VS
AMAR MAJHI & ANR
with
FAT/497/2016
IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
SAIL (ISP) BURNPUR, STEEL AUTHORITY OF
INDIA LTD
VS
GOBINDA DULAL MONDAL & ANR

with
 FAT/513/2016
 IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
 SAIL (ISP),BURNPUR,STEEL AUTHORITY OF INDIA
 LTD.
 VS
 KRIPA SINDHU MAJHI & ANR
 with
 FAT/514/2016
 IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
 SAIL (ISP),BURNPUR, STEEL AUTHORITY OF
 INDIA LTD.
 VS
 AUROBINDA MAJI & ANR
 with
 FAT/538/2016
 IA No: CAN 3 of 2025
 SAIL (ISP), BURNPUR, SAIL, IISCO STEEL PLANT,
 BURNPUR
 VS
 SANTIRANJAN MAJHI & ANR

Mr. Lakshmi Kumar Gupta,
 Mr. Kallol Bose,
 Mr. Nilanjan Pal,
 Mr. Bandhu Brata Bhula,
 ...For the Appellant in Item Nos. 45 to 54.

Mr. Partha Pratim Roy,
 Ms. Shahina Haque,
 Ms. Poulami Chakraborty,

.....For the Respondents in Item Nos. 49 & 54.

Mr. T. M. Siddiqui,
 Mr. Suddhadev Adak
 ...For the State Respondent in
 item No. 49.

Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee, Jr. Govt. Adv.
 Mr. Amrita Lal Chatterjee
For the State in Item No. 50.

Mr. Sk. Md. Galib, Sr. Govt. Advocate
 Mr. Manish Biswas
For the State in Item No.51.

Mr. Nirmalya Ray
 ...for the respondent no.1 in item no.51.

1. Learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant/requiring body commences arguments.
2. At this juncture, it is argued that the impugned award enhancing compensation was passed apparently on the premise of a single deed, which was a private document, that too executed by the father of the claimant.
3. Learned senior counsel seeks to place reliance on the appellants' application under Order XLI Rule 27 of the Code of Civil Procedure in order to produce as additional evidence five contemporaneous deeds in respect of lands proximate to those which have been acquired.
4. Learned senior counsel argues that the said deeds themselves indicate the market value prevalent at the relevant point of time in those areas.
5. Learned counsel for the claimants/respondents, at this juncture, controverts such contention and submits that the deeds sought to be produced as additional evidence were deeds executed in favour of the Eastern Coal Fields and were the product of direct purchase under a

rehabilitation scheme which contemplated the execution of the deeds coupled with employment being given to the concerned persons.

6. As such, it is submitted that the market value mentioned therein and/or the sale price cannot be a good indicator for ascertaining the actual market value of the land in the area at the relevant point of time.
7. In order to bring on record the relevant pleadings and documents, if any, the application under Order XLI Rule 27 is required to be heard on merits as well.
8. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to file their affidavit(s)-in-opposition to the same within a week from date. Reply/replies, if any, shall be filed within a week thereafter.
9. Let the matter be listed for hearing on May 21, 2025.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

(Uday Kumar, J.)