

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
SRI THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN**

AND

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD

WRIT APPEAL No.1002 OF 2018

JUDGMENT (ORAL) : (Per the Hon'ble the Chief Justice Sri Thottathil B. Radhakrishnan)

We have heard the learned Government Pleader for Land Acquisition appearing for the appellants, Sri M. Adinarayana Raju, learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2, who are writ petitioners in the writ petition in which the impugned interlocutory order was issued.

2. We have also heard learned Government Pleader for Irrigation appearing for respondent No.3 and learned Government Pleader for Stamps and Registration appearing for respondent No.4.

3. Opposing the appeal, the learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 pointed out that the impugned order was issued after detailed hearing on different dates which are shown in the opening page of the impugned order. However, we see that an order has been issued extending the interim order until further orders.

4. The learned Government Pleader for Land Acquisition, supporting the appeal, argued that the impugned order extending the interim order until further orders is made without expressing any reason for issuance of such order. He also points out that the sequence of events whereby the notification under Section 11(1) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and

Resettlement Act 30 of 2013; for short, Act 30 of 2013; was issued on 10.08.2017 and after hearing objections, declaration was made under Section 15(2) of the Act 30 of 2013 on 29.10.2017, and an award was passed on 19.12.2017 after issuing notices on 27.11.2017.

5. The substance of the writ petition from which this writ appeal arises appears to be that objections of the writ petitioners to the notification and the acquisition proceedings were not considered. Adverting to Ex.P-2 objections as well as other materials placed by the writ petitioners, we are of the view that the objections raised are predominantly on issues relatable to the personal grievances of the writ petitioners as they foresee on account of acquisition. We do not see much of a challenge on the purpose of the acquisition or that the acquisition is being made for a purpose which is not a public purpose for the purpose of Act 30 of 2013.

6. With the aforesaid, we accede to the request of the learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 and 2 that the writ petition may be considered at an early date. We, therefore, request the learned single Judge to expedite final disposal of the writ petition to enable the aforesaid process and to secure ends of justice.

7. In the meanwhile, the impugned order will stand vacated and there will be a direction that *status quo* as on today will be maintained for a period of four (4) months, within which the learned single Judge will endeavour to dispose of the writ petition from which this writ appeal arises.

8. The Writ Appeal is ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

As a sequel thereto, Miscellaneous Applications, if any, pending in this Writ Appeal stand closed.

THOTTATHIL B. RADHAKRISHNAN, CJ

GUDISEVA SHYAM PRASAD, J

July 27, 2018.

P V / V V

