

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPC No. 184 of 2019**

- Balram Prasad S/o Shri Ram Dutt Aged About 87 Years R/o Village Pand Saida , Post Saida , Tahsil Takhatpur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Public Works Department Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar Raipur, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary Department Of Revenue Mantralaya Mahanadi Bhawan Atal Nagar Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Engineer Public Works Department (National Highway Division) Raipur District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Executive Engineer, Public Works Department National Highway Division Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
5. Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue) Competent Authority (National Highway) Bilaspur District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
6. Collector District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh
7. Union Of India Through Secretary Ministry Of Road, Transport And Highways, New Delhi
8. National Highway Authority of India, Through Project Director, Bilaspur-Katghora, Section of National Highway, District Bilaspur (CG)

---- Respondent

For Petitioner
For Respondent /State
For Respondents 7 & 8

Mr. Majid Ali, Advocate
Mr. Avinash Singh, Panel Lawyer
Mr. B. Gopakumar, Assistant Solicitor
General

Order On Board By**Hon'ble Mr. Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**

22/1/2019

1. Heard.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to implead National Highway Authority of India as respondent.
3. Let it be done during the course of the day.
4. The petitioner's land situated at Village Pand, Tahsil Takhatpur, District Bilaspur (CG) was acquired for construction of National Highway Bilaspur-Katghora Section and Bilaspur - Ratanpur Bypass road.
5. While assessing compensation payable to the petitioner, multiplier factor of 1 has been applied, whereas, the Division Bench of this Court in WPC No.1649 of 2017 (Smt. Anita Agrawal Vs. State of Chhattisgarh and others) and other connected petitions, has set-aside the Notification dated 4.12.2014, applying multiplier factor of 1 with direction to the State Government to issue fresh Notification indicating the multiplier factors in terms of the guidelines laid down in the statute and the judgment of the Division Bench.
6. The following has been held by the Division Bench in para 10, 11 & 12.

“10. Further, the question is not about the power of the State Government to issue such notification, the question is the manner in which such power has been exercised which can also be levelled as mindless exercise of power since by restricting the multiplier of factor to 1.00, the State is

obviously trying to treat all land owners as one. This will deny to the poor land owners of the remote villagers, fair compensation and rehabilitation, which is the primary object behind the new Land Acquisition Act of 2013.

11. Drawing analogy from the view taken by the Division Bench of Bombay High Court, which we have quoted with due approval, Court is left with no option but to strike down the notification dated 04.12.2014 contained in Annexure P/1. A direction is issued that keeping in mind the legal position which emerges, the State Government will issue a fresh notification indicating the multiplier factors, in terms of the guidelines laid down in the statute and the judgment.

12. It goes without saying that all awards and compensations in relation to not only these Petitioners but all such persons whose lands have been acquired and a multiplier of 1.00 has been used for calculating the compensation, the same will be required to be revised and revisited in light of the new notification, which is required to be notified by the State Government, on priority."

7. In view of the above, the present writ petition is disposed of with direction that the petitioner shall move a representation before the concerned Collector (respondent No.6) within a period of 4 weeks from today. Thereafter, the said authority shall decide the representation within 10 weeks from the date of the State Government's fresh Notification in terms of the directions issued by the Division Bench.

8. The writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Judge

Shyna