

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

|             |            |              |            |
|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|
| Reserved on | 10.09.2020 | Delivered on | 15.09.2020 |
|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

WP.Nos.10912, 10920 & 11535/2020 and WMP.Nos.13259, 13269 &  
14103/2020

WP.No.10912/2020:-

1.M.Palanisamy  
2.S.Kuppathal  
3.S.Dhanlakshmi  
4.S.Chandramathi  
5.S.Sarojini  
6.R.Gowri Sankari ..Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
rep.by its Secretary to Government  
Housing and Urban Development Department  
Secretariat, Fort St George  
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Special Tahsildar [LA]  
Housing Schemes No.3  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
3. The Executive Engineer & Administrative Officer  
Coimbatore Housing Unit, Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
4. The Superintending Engineer  
Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
Salem Region, Coimbatore 641 002.
5. The Tahsildar,  
Coimbatore North Taluk  
Coimbatore. ..Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the  
Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of  
Declaration to declare the entire land acquisition proceedings

relating to proceedings covered in Award No.2/2001 dated 19.02.2001 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in respect of the lands belonging to the petitioners comprised in SF.Nos.3/2A, 4/3B1 and 4/3B2, situated at Vellakinaru Village, Coimbatore District, to an extent of 0.64.5 hectares, 0.21.0 hectares and 0.01.0 hectares respectively, totally admeasuring 0.86.5 hectares, become lapsed, by virtue of the operation of the provisions contained in Section 24[2] of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, [Act 30/2013].

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner : | Mr.P.S.Raman<br>Senior Counsel assisted by<br>Mr.G.Sankaran                                                                                                           |
| For Respondents: | Mr.Vijay Narayan<br>Advocate General assisted by<br>Mr.E.Manoharan<br>Special Government Pleader for<br>RR 1, 2 & 5 &<br>Dr.R.Gouri, Standing counsel<br>for RR 3 & 4 |

WP.No.10920/2020:-

1.M.Palanisamy  
2.S.Kuppathal  
3.S.Dhanlakshmi  
4.S.Chandramathi  
5.S.Sarojini  
6.R.Gowri Sankari  
7.M/s.Daison Constructions [I] Pvt Lt  
No.355-359, Daisy plaza, 6<sup>th</sup> Street  
Gandhipuram, Coimbatore 641 012.  
rep.by its Authorised Signatory  
N.Nagappan

.. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
rep.by its Secretary to Government  
Housing and Urban Development Department  
Secretariat, Fort St George  
Chennai 600 009.
2. The Special Tahsildar [LA]  
Housing Schemes No.3  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
3. The Executive Engineer & Administrative Officer  
Coimbatore Housing Unit, Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.

4. The Superintending Engineer  
Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
Salem Region, Coimbatore 641 002.

5. The Tahsildar,  
Coimbatore North Taluk  
Coimbatore.

.. Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Declaration to declare the entire land acquisition proceedings relating to proceedings covered in Award No.2/2001 dated 19.02.2001 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in respect of the lands belonging to the petitioners comprised in SF.Nos.4/3C1, 4/3C2,11/1 and 11/2 situated at Vellakinaru Village, Coimbatore District to an extent of 0.90.5 Hectares, 0.02.02 Hectares, 1.72.0 Hectares and 0.60.0 hectares respectively, totally admeasuring 2.70.5 hectares, become lapsed, by virtue of the operation of the provisions contained in Section 24[2] of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Re-settlement Act, [Act 30/2013].

For Petitioner : Mr.P.S.Raman  
Senior Counsel assisted by  
Mr.G.Sankaran

For Respondents : Mr.Vijay Narayan  
Advocate General assisted by  
Mr.E.Manoharan  
Special Government Pleader for  
RR 1, 2 & 5 &  
Dr.R.Gouri, Standing counsel  
for RR 3 & 4

WP.No.11535/2020:-

1.N.Devanathan  
2.V.Viji  
3.M/s.Martin Multi Projects [P] Ltd  
rep.by its Director,  
No.54, Mettupalayam Road,  
Gnanmbika Mills Post, Coimbatore Taluk  
Coimbatore 641029.

..Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Tamil Nadu  
rep.by its Secretary to Government  
Housing and Urban Development Department  
Secretariat, Fort St George  
Chennai 600 009.

2. The Special Tahsildar [LA]  
Housing Schemes No.3  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
3. The Executive Engineer & Administrative Officer  
Coimbatore Housing Unit, Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
4. The Superintending Engineer  
Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
Salem Region, Coimbatore 641 002.
5. The Tahsildar,  
Coimbatore North Taluk  
Coimbatore.

.. Respondents

Prayer:- Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for issuance of a Writ of Declaration to declare the entire land acquisition proceedings relating to proceedings covered in Award No.2/2001 dated 19.02.2001 of the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent in respect of the lands belonging to the petitioners comprised in SF.Nos.3/2B and 4/3A, situated at Vellakinaru Village, Coimbatore District, to an extent of Acre 1.58 cents, Acre 0.54 cents respectively, totally admeasuring Acre 2.12 cents, become lapsed, by virtue of the operation of the provisions contained in Section 24[2] of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, [Act 30/2013].

For Petitioner : Mr.P.S.Raman  
Senior Counsel assisted by  
Mr.G.Sankaran

For Respondents: Mr.Vijay Narayan  
Advocate General assisted by  
Mr.E.Manoharan  
Special Government Pleader for  
RR 1, 2 & 5 &  
Dr.R.Gouri, Standing counsel  
for RR 3 & 4

#### COMMON ORDER

- (1) The issues involved in all the above writ petitions are almost identical except for some small variations on facts and hence, all the writ petitions are heard together and this Court proceeds to pass this common order.

- (2) The writ petitioners in WP.Nos.10912 and 10920 of 2020 claim their right from the common owners, viz., late Marudhachala Gounder and late Sarasammal. The subject property involved in both the writ petitions originally belonged to one late Marudhachala Gounder and late Sarasammal. The revenue records also stood in their names. They had a son named Ramasamy Gounder who pre-deceased them. In WP.No.10912 of 2020, petitioners 1 to 4 are the children of late Marudhachala Gounder and late Sarasammal and petitioners 5 and 6 are the wife and daughter of late Ramasamy Gounder. In WP.No.10920 of 2020, petitioners 1 to 4 are the children of late Marudhachala Gounder and late Sarasammal and petitioners 5 and 6 are the wife and daughter of late Ramasamy Gounder and the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner is a subsequent purchaser of the property from petitioners 1 to 6.
- (3) Insofar as WP.No.11535 of 2020, the subject property originally belonged to one V.R.Natarajan and the revenue records also stood in his name. Petitioners 1 and 2 are the son and daughter of late V.R.Natarajan and the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner is the subsequent purchaser of the subject property from petitioners 1 and 2.
- (4) The properties in question became the subject matter of land acquisition along with several other properties and Section 4 [1] Notification was issued on 02.01.1998. Thereafter, Section 6 Declaration was made on 18.02.1999. Aggrieved by the same, late Marudhachala Gounder, late Sarasammal, late V.R.Natarajan and others filed WP.No.12250 of 1999. The writ petition was admitted and stay was granted only insofar as the possession is concerned.
- (5) The writ petition was dismissed vide order dated 27.12.2004. Aggrieved by the same, WA.No.835 of 2007 was preferred and the same was also dismissed vide judgment dated 27.06.2007. According to the petitioners, no further steps were taken by the respondents and the petitioners were not informed about the passing of the Award and no compensation was paid to them and the petitioners also continued to be in possession and enjoyment of the subject properties. The further case of the petitioners is that the subject properties are all agricultural lands and they continue to remain in the same status. The patta also stood in their names.
- (6) The subject property in WP.No.10920 of 2020 came to be sold in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner by virtue of a registered Sale Deed dated 11.05.2009 and the name of the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner was also entered in the revenue records and patta was granted in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner.
- (7) The subject property in WP.No.11535 of 2020 came to be sold in favour of the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent by virtue of a registered Sale Deed dated 12.10.2009 and the name of the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner was also entered in the revenue records and patta was granted in favour of the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner.

- (8) The officials belonging to the Tamil Nadu Housing Board [TNHB] came to the subject properties and informed the petitioners that the properties have already been acquired by the Government and the possession has been handed over to the TNHB and they wanted to proceed further to implement a project. It also came to the notice of the petitioners that the TNHB has issued a Tender Notification on 03.06.2020 inviting tenders for development of the Housing Scheme in the subject properties. The petitioners also came to understand that the patta has been transferred in the name of the TNHB by virtue of the orders passed by the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent on 15.06.2020. A Public Notice was also issued by the Town and Country Planning Authority, Coimbatore with regard to the change of user of land from agricultural to residential and objections were called for from the general public. According to the petitioners, it is only at this point of time, they came to understand that an Award has been passed behind their back and the petitioners were kept in the dark for so many years and neither compensation was paid to them nor the possession was taken from them.
- (9) Aggrieved by the action taken by the respondents, writ petitions have been filed for the issue of a writ of Declaration to declare that the entire land acquisition proceedings with regard to the subject properties has lapsed by virtue of the operation of provision under Section 24[2] of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 [hereinafter called as 'The Act'].
- (10) The 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent has filed counter affidavits in all the writ petitions. The relevant portions in the respective counter affidavits are extracted hereunder:-

WP.No.10912/2020:-

'7 It is submitted that the dry lands in SF.No.3/2A, 4/3B1, 4/3B2 to an extent of 2.14 acres of lands possession which vested with the Government and taken over by the Land Acquisition Officer along with other dry lands to an extent of 15.37 acres was handed over to the Tamil Nadu Housing Board vide Possession Certificate on 14.08.2006 as per Land Acquisition Act, from that the peaceful possession is vested with the Tamil Nadu Housing Board.

8 It is submitted that the entire compensation amount of Rs.38,83,496/- in respect of lands in SF.No.1,2,3&4 has been deposited in Treasury account on 01.03.2001, since the Notified persons who appeared during the enquiry refused to receive the compensation and contended that the Court cases filed were pending before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras.

9 It is submitted that now the

petitioners Thiru M.Palanisamy & 5 others filed this writ petition after taken over of possession by Tamil Nadu Housing Board and compensation amount was deposited in Treasury Account as per Land Acquisition Act to prolong the litigation taking shelter under Section 24 [2] of the New Act which cannot be applied to the present case on hand in the light, facts and circumstances of the case. It is pertinent to mention at this juncture that petitioners have filed this writ petition to after 19 years after the Award dated 19.02.001. Equally after the period of 16 years when the WP.No.12250/1999 which came to be filed by the petitioner's father Maruthachala Gounder [arrayed as 10<sup>th</sup> petitioner in the said writ petition] challenging the land acquisition proceedings which came to be dismissed on 27.12.2004, which was confirmed by the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court in WA.No.835/07 on 27.06.2007.....

18 It is submitted that the Draft Notification under section 4[1] of the Land Acquisition Act was approved by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.4 Housing & Urban Development Department dated 02.01.1998 and published at pages 1 & 2 of Part II Section-2 of supplement of the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette No.5A. The above notification was also published in Tamil dailies ''Thina Boomi'' and ''Malaimalar'' on 17.02.1998 and 16.02.1998 respectively. The substance of the Notification was also published in the locality on 20.02.1998.

19 It is submitted that the enquiry under Section 5-A of Land Acquisition Act was conducted by the Land Acquisition Officer and Special Tahsildar [LA] Housing Scheme Unit No.1, Coimbatore on 05.06.1998. During the course of enquiry all of the land owners have raised their objections for the acquisition of their lands. The copy of objection obtained from the land owners were communicated to the requisition Body for the remarks. The Executive Engineer and Administrative Officer in his Letter dated 23.7.1998 to overrule all the objections since they are general in nature.

20 It is submitted that the Government after considering the objection raised by land owners at the time of 5-A enquiry and overruled all the objections.

21 It is submitted that Draft

Declaration under Section-6 of Land Acquisition Act was approved by the Government in G.O.Ms.No.53 Housing & Urban Development Department dated 18.02.1999 and published on 18.02.1999 in the Tamil Nadu Government Gazette issued in pages 1-2. The Draft Declaration was also published in the Tamil Dailies, viz., 'Malai Malar', 'Dhinakaran' on 20.02.1999. The substance of the above notification was published in the locality on 20.02.1999.

22 It is submitted that the Draft Direction under Section 7 of Land Acquisition Act was approved by the Collector, Coimbatore in his proceedings No.121246/95/F5 dt.30.06.1999.

23 It is submitted that the notice under section 9[1] & 10 of Land Acquisition Act was published in the village to inform the persons interested on the lands covered under acquisition about the enquiry under Section 11 of Land Acquisition Act, individual notices under section 9[3] and 10 of Land Acquisition were served on the persons interested over their rights on the lands under acquisition to appear in person.

24 It is submitted that the enquiry under Section 11 of Land Acquisition Act was conducted by the Land Acquisition Officer and Special Tahsildar [LA], Housing Scheme, Unit 1, Coimbatore on 25.01.2001. Thiru R.Maruthachala Gounder, S/o Ramana Gounder is the notified person for the SF No.3/2A, 4/3B1 & 4/3B2 to an extent of 0.86.5 Hectares. He has been served with notice for award enquiry. He has not appeared for enquiry but the favour of him, his son Thiru.M.Ramasamy appeared for enquiry. He has stated that as per patta No.228, the lands owned by the notified persons. No documentary evidence was produced in this regard. He has stated that the notified person has approached the High Court, Madras to quash the LA Activities in WP.No.12250/1999 dated 26.7.99 has obtained order of stay from the High Court, Madras for disposal of the writ petition. Therefore, notified persons refused to receive the compensation amount. Hence, the compensation amount ordered to be deposited in Civil Court u/s.30 and 31[2] of the Land Acquisition Act.

25 It is submitted that the Award was pronounced by the Land Acquisition Officer in

Award No.2/01 dt.19.02.2001. The Award is for Block No.8 comprising an extent of 9.46.5 hectares. All the notified persons appeared for enquiry and they have given their statement. It is submitted that the notified person [including the petitioner's father herein] have approached the High Court, Chennai and filed Writ petition No.12250/1999 against the Acquisition proceedings and obtained an order of stay of dispossession on 20.07.1999.

26 It is submitted that, the entire compensation amount of Rs.38,83,496/- in respect of lands in SF.No.1,2,3&4 has been deposited in Treasury Account on 01.03.2001, since notified persons refused to receive the compensation amount court cases filed before the Hon'ble High Court Madras.

27 It is submitted that the Hon'ble High Court of Madras dismissed the WP.No.12250/99 on 27.12.2004 and observed that 'a perusal of the file discloses that section 4 [1] declaration was ordered on 2.1.1998 and published in the gazette on 11.2.1998. The Notification was subsequently published in the dailies on 16.2.1998 and 17.2.1998 and the publication in the locality was effected on 20.2.1998. The declaration under section 6 has been issued on 18.2.1999. Therefore, the issue on section 6 declaration is within the period of limitation' and 'it is found that Mr.K.Mohankumar, viz., the third petitioner had received the notice on behalf of Mr.K.Senthil Nathan, viz., the 4<sup>th</sup> petitioner. Mr.K.Suresh Kumar, viz., the fifth petitioner and Mr.M.Arunachalam, viz., the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner herein. The second petitioner Mr.K.Sivakamami had also received the notice. The 11<sup>th</sup> petitioner Tmt.Sarasammal and the 12<sup>th</sup> petitioner Mr.V.R.Natarajan and the 13<sup>th</sup> petitioner Mr.S.Rangasamy Gounder have also received the notice, as could be seen at the back side of the said notice. Therefore, the said contention also fails.'

28 It is submitted that, after the Dismissal of the WP.No.122250/99, the possession of the dry lands which already stood vested with the Government with physical possession was handed over to the Tamil Nadu Housing Board by the Land Acquisition Officer cum Special Tahsildar [LA], Coimbatore on 14.08.2006. From

the date of taken over of possession to till date, the lands vested with Tamil Nadu Housing Board.

29 It is submitted that the WA.No.835/2007 has been filed before Hon'ble High Court against the WP.No.12250/99 dated 27.12.2004. The Hon'ble Division Bench of High Court dismissed the WA.No.835/2007 on 27.04.2007 and upheld the entire land acquisition proceedings.

30 It is submitted that the subject lands are situated at the vantage point and the exclusion of the lands will affect the comprehensive nature of the scheme.

31 It is submitted that, the Revenue Records was also stands in the name of Tamil Nadu Housing Board.

32 It is submitted that, the subject lands are dry lands, there is no agricultural activities happened before and after the Land Acquisition proceedings. Since the contentions raised about the agricultural lands are not maintainable. The land acquisition proceedings were made as per provisions contemplated in the Land Acquisition Act.

33 It is submitted that along with the subject land and adjacent lands, the Tamil Nadu Housing Board proposed to implement Thudiyalur and Vellakiner Neighbourhood Scheme to an extent of 66.13 acres. The scheme was announced in the floor of the assembly on 24.03.2020. The tender was also called for the Scheme works on 26.06.2020 and tender opened by the Superintending Engineer, Salem Circle on 26.06.2200 @ 11.15 AM. The Scheme works like surveying, bushes cleaning and other works are going on in the site.

34 It is submitted that, now the petitioners Thiru.M.Palanisamy & 4 Others filed this writ petition after taken over of possession by Tamil Nadu Housing Board and Compensation amount was deposited in Treasury Account as per Land Acquisition Act to prolong the issue and it is nothing but abuse process of law and attempting to grabbing the Government acquired land.'

WP.No.10920/2020:-

''8 It is further submitted that the Respondent has been advised to submit that the Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down the

proposition of law as laid down in Shiv Kumar and Another Vs. Union of India and Others reported in [2019] 10 SCC 229 wherein it has been held that a purchaser of the acquired land after Section 4 Notification [issued under the Land Acquisition Act 1894] does not acquire any right in the land concerned as such the sale itself is ab initio void and that the transaction does not clothe them with the title and that it is a void transaction. Wherein the law has been settled in this regard by catena of decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court that an incumbent, who has purchased the land after Section 4 Notification has no right to question the acquisition.

9 It is submitted that the proposition of law as laid down in Shiv Kumar and Another V. Union of India and others reported in [2019] 10 SCC 229 has been endorsed by the Constitutional Bench Judgment dated 06.03.2020 passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in Indore Development Authority case in para 337 of the said judgment. The law has been laid down that the purchaser after Section 4 Notification does not acquire any right in the land as the sale is ab initio void and has no right to claim land under the policy and that such incumbents cannot invoke the provision of Section 24 of the 2013 Act as the transaction once void is always a void transaction, as no title can be acquired in the land as much no such declaration can be sought. It is submitted that in the light of the above settled proposition of law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the act of the writ petitioner to continue the legal proceedings to get rid of the encumbrances is misconceived and is only an attempt to get rid of the law laid down by the Apex Court as stated above and is attempt to achieve indirectly what cannot be achieved directly. All the acts, commission and omissions on the part both the Writ petitioner and the subsequent illegal purchaser are all contrary to the laws of the land and only depicts their conduct that they have not approached the Court with clean hands. There is no iota of truth and semblance of right to the writ petitioner which is only being canvassed for the benefit of the illegal subsequent purchaser before this Hon'ble Court

and therefore, the petitions are liable to be dismissed at the threshold.

10 It is submitted that the dry lands in SF.No.4/3C1, 4/3C2, 11/1 and 11/2 to an extent of 5.58 acres of dry lands possession taken over by the Land Acquisition Officer along with other dry lands to an extent of 15.37 acres has handed over the same to the Tamil Nadu Housing Board vide Possession Certificate on 14.08.2006 as per Land Acquisition Act, from that the peaceful possession is vested with the Tamil Nadu Housing Board.

11 It is submitted that the entire compensation amount of Rs.38,83,496/- in respect of lands in SF.No.1,2,3&4 has been deposited in Treasury account on 01.03.2001, since the Notified persons who appeared during the enquiry refused to receive the compensation and contended that the court cases filed were pending before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras.

12 It is submitted that, now the petitioners Thiru M.Palanisamy and 6 Others filed this writ petition after taken over of possession by Tamil Nadu Housing Board and Compensation Amount was deposited in Treasury Account as per Land Acquisition Act to prolong the litigation taking shelter under Section 24 [2] of the New Act which cannot be applied to the present case on hand in the light, facts and circumstances of the case. It is pertinent to mention at this juncture that petitioners have filed this writ petition after 19 years after the Award dated 19.12.2001. Equally after the period of 16 years when the WP.No.12250/1999 which came to be filed by the petitioner's mother Tmt.Sarasammal [arrayed as 11<sup>th</sup> petitioner in the said writ petition] challenging land acquisition proceedings which came to be dismissed on 27.12.2004, which was confirmed by the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court in WA.No.835/2007 dated 27.06.2007.'

This counter affidavit is adopted in WP.No.11535 of 2020 also.  
(11)Mr.P.S.Raman, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr.G.Sankaran, learned counsel for the petitioners, made the following submissions:-

- ➔ The petitioners were kept completely in dark with regard to the Award Proceedings and neither compensation was paid nor possession was taken and therefore, by operation of Section 24[2] of the Act, the entire acquisition proceedings has

lapsed.

- ➔ The patta stood in the name of the petitioners right through and the petitioners were not even informed about the Award Proceedings or about the fact that the property has been handed over to the TNHB and when the Sale Deed was executed in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner in WP.No.10920 of 2020 and the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner in WP.No.11535 of 2020.
- ➔ For several years there was absolutely no action on the part of the TNHB to take possession or to start any project and it all started only after an announcement was made in the Floor of the Assembly on 24.03.2020 to implement a Scheme and thereafter, the tender was called on 03.06.2020. The patta was transferred in a hasty manner in the name of the TNHB only on 15.06.2020 and till today, majority of the agricultural lands have not been converted as residential and the same is clear from the Public Notice issued by the Town and Country Authority, Coimbatore on 28.06.2020.
- ➔ The only document that has been filed by the respondents in order to establish the fact that possession was taken, is a Possession Certificate which is said to have been issued by the Revenue Authorities to the TNHB in the year 2006. However, the Government has not come forward by filing a counter affidavit and categorically state as to when the possession was taken from the petitioners. The so-called Possession Certificate is not a document to prove taking of possession from the petitioners and the only mode of taking possession is by drawing a Panchanama in the presence of the witnesses and the same has not been done in the present case.
- ➔ It is clear from the Award enquiry that the compensation was not tendered to the owners of the land nor was it deposited in a Court nor was there a revenue deposit and the only document that has been filed by the Housing Board to prove the deposit of the compensation is a Challan issued by the State Bank of India, Treasury Branch, Coimbatore, which account is in the nature of Personal Deposit Account [PD Account] and this deposit will not satisfy the requirements of a Treasury deposit. Therefore, the compensation was also not paid to any of the land owners in accordance with law.
- ➔ The dismissal of the Writ Petition and the Writ Appeal will confine itself only to the Section 4[1] Notification and Section 6 Declaration and the same was upheld. However, the term "concluded proceedings" will take within its fold Section 4[1] Notification, Section 6 Declaration, Section 11 Award and taking of possession and only if all these requirements are satisfied, the property will vest under Section 16 of the Old Act. In the absence of payment

of the Award amount and taking of the possession of the property, the earlier dismissal of the Writ Petition and Writ Appeal cannot be construed as concluded proceedings.

- ➔ There is no delay on the part of the petitioners in approaching this Court since the cause of action arose only when the officials belonging to the TNHB came to the property and the Tender Notification was issued calling for tenders to undertake the project. According to the petitioners, the acquisition itself has lapsed by operation of law under Section 24[2] of the Act and there was no necessity for the petitioners to come to this Court earlier. The action of the respondents created a fresh cause of action forcing the petitioners to approach this Court.
  - ➔ Even though the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Shivkumar and Others V. Union Of India and Others in Civil Appeal No.8003 of 2019, dated 14.10.2019, has held that a sale made subsequent to the Section 4[1] Notification is null and void and non est in the eye of law, the same does not disentitle the original owners to challenge the action of the respondents. That is the reason why the original owners along with the subsequent purchasers have filed the writ petitions. Rendering the Sale Deed as null and void will restore the original position and thereby, the other petitioners other than the subsequent purchasers, can always question the action of the respondents and that has not been barred by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the judgment in Shivkumar's case.
  - ➔ As an alternative submission, the learned Senior counsel submitted that compensation in respect of the majority of the land holdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries and therefore, even if this Court is to hold that the acquisition proceedings has not lapsed, the petitioners will be entitled for compensation in accordance with the 2013 Act. The learned Senior counsel specifically relied upon the proviso to Section 24[2] of the Act to substantiate this submission.
- (12) Mr. Vijay Narayan, learned Advocate General assisted by Mr. E. Manoharan, learned Special Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the State and Dr. R. Gouri, learned Standing counsel appearing on behalf of the TNHB made the following submissions:-
- The Government acquired nearly 370 acres of lands under the Thudiyalur - Vellakiner Neighbourhood Scheme. The possession was taken and handed over to the Requisitioning Body, viz., TNHB. The Scheme is implemented in a phased manner from the year 1995 onwards and till the year 2017, 104.753 acres have been utilised in five phases and the plots have been allotted to the general public and shelterless persons. Even while the schemes were

implemented in a phased manner, in the year 2009 itself, it was proposed to implement Phase VI to X for another extent of 129.82 acres and thereby, it was proposed to develop 1637 plots. The layout was also prepared and the preliminary work was also started in the year 2013-14. Since some of the land owners had approached the Court, the Housing Board was not able to implement Phase VI to X. The respondents identified litigation free lands to an extent of 66.13 acres and decided to proceed further with the scheme.

- The scheme was announced in the Floor of the Assembly on 24.03.2020. The tender was called for handing over the work on 03.06.2020 and on allotment of the work to the successful bidders, the preliminary work like surveying, clearing of bushes and other works have been taken up in the site.
- The subject properties involved in the writ petitions was handed over to the TNHB as early as on 14.08.2006 and the Possession Certificate, evidencing the same, has been produced to substantiate this submission.
- The entire compensation amount has been deposited in the Treasury Account on 01.03.2001 since the notified persons who appeared during the enquiry, refused to receive the compensation and contended that the Court cases filed, were pending before the High Court of Madras.
- The petitioners have sought for a declaration, to declare that the acquisition proceedings has lapsed by virtue of the operation of Section 24[2] of the Act and in order to take advantage of the said provision, the petitioners will have to establish that both, the physical possession of the property has not been taken as well as the compensation has not been paid and that both the ingredients are not satisfied in the present case.
- The writ petitions filed in WP.Nos.10920 and 11535 of 2020 are liable to be rejected at the threshold since the property in question has been sold in favour of the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner and 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner respectively and the

said sale is void and non est in law and the relief under Section 24[2] of the Act, cannot be maintained in view of the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Shivkumar and Another Vs. Union of India in Civil Appeal No.8003 of 2019 dated 14.10.2019.

- The deposit of the Award amount was well within the knowledge of all the land owners and some of the land owners even withdrew the compensation and the same is clear from the order passed by the learned Single Judge in WP.No.12250 of 1999.
- If at all there was any illegality in the payment of compensation and taking of possession, the petitioners

ought to have questioned the same during the contemporaneous time and the same cannot be questioned after nearly 14 years and the very claim made by the petitioners is stale and hit by laches.

- The petitioners cannot reopen concluded proceedings since in the present case, the Section 4 Notification and Section 6 Declaration was upheld by this Court and thereafter, the Award was passed and it was also deposited in the Treasury Account and the possession was also taken, thereby, the entire property has vested with the Government under Section 16 of the 1894 Act.
  - The petitioners are also not entitled for the alternative relief claimed by them under the proviso to Section 24[2] of the Act since the provision itself categorically states that it will apply only where the compensation has not been deposited in respect of majority of land holdings and in the present case, there is absolutely no data provided by the petitioners to substantiate that majority of the land holdings have not been paid compensation.
  - The learned Advocate General, in order to substantiate all his submissions, heavily relied upon the Judgment of the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Indore Development Authority V. Manoharlal and Others* reported in 2020 SCC Online SC 316.
- (13) This Court has carefully considered the submissions made on either side and the materials available on record.
- (14) There are two sets of writ petitions that have been filed seeking for declaration to declare that the acquisition proceedings relating to the subject properties stands lapsed, by virtue of the operation of the provisions contained in Section 24[2] of the Act. WP.No.10912 of 2020 has been filed by the legal heirs of the original owner of the property. WP.Nos.10920 of 2020 and 11535 of 2020 have been filed by the legal heirs of the original owners along with the subsequent purchasers. Insofar as the latter two writ petitions are concerned, a preliminary objection has been raised by the learned Advocate General regarding its maintainability by placing heavy reliance upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in *Shivkumar and Another V. Union of India and others* reported in 2019 [10] SCC 229. By citing this judgment, it was contended that the transaction of sale that was effected after the Section 4 Notification, is void and non est in the eye of law and the subsequent purchaser is not clothed with the title over the property and therefore, they cannot claim the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act. In view of this preliminary objection taken by the respondents, this Court now proceeds to take up these two writ petitions first for consideration.
- (15) The relevant portions in the Judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in *Shivkumar* case [cited supra] is extracted hereunder:-

''8.It has been laid down that the purchasers on any ground whatsoever cannot question proceedings for taking possession. A purchaser after Section 4 notification does not acquire any right in the land as the sale is ab initio void and has no right to claim land under the policy.

9.When we ponder as to beneficial provisions of the 2013 Act, they also intend to benefit landowners mentioned in the notification under Section 4, not for the benefit of such purchasers who purchase the land after it has been vested in the State.

.....

15.A rehabilitation and resettlement scheme has to be prepared under Section 16. Section 17 deals with the review of such a scheme. An approved scheme to be made public under Section 18. Section 19 deals with the publication of declaration and summary of rehabilitation and resettlement scheme. After inquiry, award is passed by the Collector under Section 23. The Collector is required to consider, among other things, the interest of the person claiming the compensation, rehabilitation, and resettlement while making an award.

16.Section 24 of the 2013 Act, which deals with land acquisition made under the 1894 Act, is also relevant. The same is extracted hereunder:

"24.Land acquisition process under Act No. 1 of 1894 shall be deemed to have lapsed in certain cases.-(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, in any case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894)-

(a) where no award under Section 11 of the said Land Acquisition Act has been made, then, all provisions of this Act relating to the determination of compensation shall apply; or

(b) where an award under said Section 11 has been made, then such proceedings shall continue under the provisions of the said Land Acquisition Act, as if the said Act has not been repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), in case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894), where an award under the said Section 11 has been made five years or more prior to the commencement of this Act but the physical possession of the land has not been taken, or the compensation has not been paid the said proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed and the appropriate Government, if it so chooses, shall initiate the proceedings of such land acquisition afresh in accordance with the provisions of this Act:

Provided that where an award has been made, and compensation in respect of a majority of landholdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries, then, all beneficiaries specified in the notification for acquisition under Section 4 of the said Land Acquisition Act, shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

17. Section 24(2) provides that in case the award has been passed five years or more prior to the commencement of the Act, but the physical possession of the land has not been taken, or the compensation has not been paid, the said proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed. It is not the case set up that compensation had not been paid to purchasers/owners. The only case set up is that physical possession has not been taken and proceedings of taking over possession have been questioned to take advantage of provisions under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act. Whereas, averment in the writ petition itself indicates that possession had been taken over in the year 2000 and that unauthorised colonies have come up in the area. Thus, it is clear that possession, if any, is illegal, and in fact, the actual physical possession had been taken, and re-entering in possession in an unauthorised manner can confer no right. There is nothing to doubt that actual physical possession had been taken in the year 2000. Thus, Section 24(2) is not attracted in the case.

18. Even otherwise, proviso to Section 24(2) does not recognise a purchaser after Section 4 notification inasmuch as it provides that where an award has been made, and the compensation in respect of a majority of landholdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries, then, all beneficiaries specified in the notification for acquisition issued under the 1894 Act, shall be entitled to compensation under the provisions of the 2013 Act. The proviso makes it clear that in case of compensation concerning the majority of landholdings has not been deposited, then recorded owner(s) at the time of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act shall have the right to receive the compensation. Purchasers after Section 4 notification have not been given the right to receive the higher compensation under the provisions contained in the 2013 Act.

19. The 2013 Act presupposes that a person is required to be rehabilitated and resettled. Such a person who has purchased after Section 4 notification as sale deed is void under the 1894 Act, cannot claim rehabilitation and resettlement as per policy envisaged under the 2013 Act, as his land has not been acquired, but he has purchased a property which has already been acquired by the State Government, he cannot claim even higher compensation, as per proviso to Section 24(2) under the 2013 Act. An original landowner cannot be deprived of higher value under the 2013 Act, which higher compensation was not so contemplated when the void transaction of sale had been entered, and right is conferred under the proviso to Section 24(2) on recorded owners under the 1894 Act. We have come across instances in which after notifications under Section 4 were issued and, the property was purchased at throwaway prices by the builders and unscrupulous persons, such purchases are void and confer no right even to claim higher compensation under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act as it is to be given to the owner as mentioned in the notification.

20. Given that, the transaction of sale, effected after Section 4 notification, is void, is ineffective to transfer the land, such incumbents cannot invoke the provisions of Section 24. As the sale transaction did not

clothe them with the title when the purchase was made; they cannot claim "possession" and challenge the acquisition as having lapsed under Section 24 by questioning the legality or regularity of proceedings of taking over of possession under the 1894 Act. It would be unfair and profoundly unjust and against the policy of the law to permit such a person to claim resettlement or claim the land back as envisaged under the 2013 Act. When he has not been deprived of his livelihood but is a purchaser under a void transaction, the outcome of exploitative tactics played upon poor farmers who were unable to defend themselves.

21. Thus, under the provisions of Section 24 of the 2013 Act, challenge to acquisition proceeding of the taking over of possession under the 1894 Act cannot be made, based on a void transaction nor declaration can be sought under Section 24(2) by such incumbents to obtain the land. The declaration that acquisition has lapsed under the 2013 Act is to get the property back whereas, the transaction once void, is always a void transaction, as no title can be acquired in the land as such no such declaration can be sought. It would not be legal, just and equitable to give the land back to purchaser as land was not capable of being sold which was in process of acquisition under the 1894 Act. The 2013 Act does not confer any right on purchaser whose sale is ab initio void. Such void transactions are not validated under the 2013 Act. No rights are conferred by the provisions contained in the 2013 Act on such a purchaser as against the State.

22. "Void is, ab initio," a nullity, is inoperative, and a person cannot claim the land or declaration once no title has been conferred upon him to claim that the land should be given back to him. A person cannot enforce and ripe fruits based on a void transaction to start claiming title and possession of the land by seeking a declaration under Section 24 of the 2013 Act; it will amount to conferment of benefit never contemplated by the law. The question is, who can claim declaration/rights under Section 24(2) for the restoration of land or lapse of acquisition. It cannot be by a person with no title in the land. The provision of the 2013 Act cannot be said to be enabling or

authorising a purchaser after Section 4 to question proceeding taken under the Act of 1894 of taking possession as held in U.P. Jal Nigam [U.P. Jal Nigam v. Kalra Properties (P) Ltd., (1996) 3 SCC 124] which is followed in M. Venkatesh [M. Venkatesh v. BDA, (2015) 17 SCC 1 : (2017) 5 SCC (Civ) 387] and other decisions and consequently claim declaration under Section 24 of the 2013 Act. What cannot be done directly cannot be permitted in an indirect method.

23. The provisions of the 2013 Act aimed at the acquisition of land with least disturbance to the landowners and other affected families and to provide just and fair compensation to affected families whose land has been acquired or proposed to be acquired or are affected and to make adequate provisions for such affected persons for their rehabilitation and resettlement. The provisions of the 2013 Act aim at ousting all inter-meddlers from the fray by ensuring payment in the bank account of landholders under Section 77 of the Act.'

(16) A careful reading of the above judgment would show that Section 24[2] of the Act does not recognise a subsequent purchaser of the property after the issuance of Section 4 Notification. Such a Sale Deed is void and non est in the eye of law since the property has been purchased after it was acquired by the State Government. This provision was only intended for the original land owner for whom a benefit was given under Section 24[2] of the Act where the acquisition proceedings itself will be rendered has lapsed provided the requirements of Section 24[2] of the Act is satisfied or in the alternative, they are provided with an opportunity to get a higher compensation, if they fulfill the requirements under the proviso to Section 24[2] of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has held that it would be unfair and profoundly unjust and against the policy of law to permit a subsequent purchaser to claim the benefits of Section 24[2] of the Act or the proviso thereunder. The reason given by the Apex Court for coming to such a conclusion is that such a subsequent purchaser will not fall within the term 'interested person' and he cannot be considered to be a person who can claim for resettlement or claim the land back as envisaged under the 2013 Act. In short, void transactions that take place after the issuance of the Section 4 Notification, will not be validated under the 2013 Act and such a subsequent purchaser cannot claim any rights as against the State.

(17) In the present case, it is seen that the 7<sup>th</sup> petitioner in WP.No.10920 of 2020 has purchased the property by a registered Sale Deed dated 11.05.2009 and the 3<sup>rd</sup> petitioner in

WP.No.11535 of 2020 has purchased the property by a registered Sale Deed dated 12.10.2009. This sale has taken place much after the Award was passed and the alleged possession was taken in the year 2006. The learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners in both these writ petitions submitted that the writ petitions have not been filed only by the subsequent purchasers and it has been filed by the land owners along with the subsequent purchasers. Therefore, it was contended that even if the sale is rendered to be void and non est in the eye of law, it will restore back to the original position and the original owners can always maintain a writ petition and claim the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act or in the alternative, the proviso thereunder.

(18) The main object of the 2013 Act was to ensure a comprehensive package for the land owners, comprehensive rehabilitation and resettlement package for the land owners, to ensure their livelihood and to ensure that all projects leading to the displacement of the land owners must undergo a social impact assessment to satisfy that the particular land is needed for a public purpose and at the same time, the rights of the vulnerable sections, viz., the displaced persons, is protected. The very object of Section 24[2] of the Act is to ensure that a land which has not been put to use even after acquisition by not taking possession of the same and where even compensation has not been paid, must be restored back to the original owner and if in case it is required in future, proceedings can be initiated under the new Act. That is the reason why the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India categorically held in the above judgment that a subsequent purchaser can never claim the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act or the proviso thereunder.

(19) Even though the contention raised by the learned Senior counsel seems to be impressive in the first blush, on a closer scrutiny, this Court finds that the same is not sustainable. As on today, the persons who are actually driving the process to claim the relief under Section 24[2] of the Act, are the subsequent purchasers only. They are using the names of the original owners in order to achieve their object. In other words, what cannot be directly achieved in view of the categorical pronouncement of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Shivkumar case [referred supra], is sought to be achieved indirectly by using the names of the original owners. The original owners today, are merely the shadows of the subsequent purchasers and this is very evident from the fact that the subsequent purchasers have also safely made themselves as the petitioners in both the writ petitions.

(20) This Court is reminded of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, in State of Tamil Nadu Vs. V.K. Shyam Sunder reported in 2011 [8] SCC 737 and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder:-

''43.''21.It is a settled proposition of law that what cannot be done directly, is not permissible to be done obliquely, meaning thereby, whatever is prohibited by law to be done, cannot legally be effected by an indirect and circuitous contrivance on the principle of quando aliquid prohibetur, prohibetur et omne per quod devenitur ad illud.''

(21)If this practice is allowed, the judgment rendered by the Apex Court in Shivkumar case [referred supra] will be rendered otiose and in every case, a subsequent purchaser will start claiming the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act or the proviso thereunder through the original owners of the property. This practice must be nipped in the bud, failing which, the judgment of the Apex Court will become totally ineffective and a speculative builder or a Developer who was aware about the acquisition proceedings and in spite of the same, proceeds to purchase the property, can always turn around and use the original owners as a bogey in order to achieve his objective of making a claim under Section 24[2] of the Act. Therefore, such speculative builders or Developers should clearly understand that they cannot try to achieve the benefit by adding the original owners as a party in the writ petition since they are none other than the alter egos of the original owners. Permitting the subsequent purchasers to use this ploy in every case, will go totally against the very object of the 2013 Act. Therefore, just because the subsequent purchaser choose to add the original owners also as petitioners in the writ petitions, that will not, in any way pave way to maintain such a writ petition in the teeth of the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court in Shivkumar case [referred supra].

(22)In view of the above discussion, this Court sustains the preliminary objection raised by the learned Advocate General with regard to the maintainability of the writ petitions in WP.Nos.10920 and 11535 of 2020 and holds that both the writ petitions are not maintainable and the petitioners are not entitled to claim the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act or the proviso thereunder and both the writ petitions, viz., WP.Nos.10920 and 11535 of 2020, stand dismissed.

(23)This Court will now take up WP.No.10912 of 2020 for consideration.

(24)Before going into the issues raised in this writ petition, it will be more beneficial to take note of the judgment of the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Indore Development Authority Vs Manoharlal and Others reported in 2020 SCC Online SC 316. The questions raised for consideration of the Constitution Bench are found at paragraph Nos.4 and 5 of the judgment and the same are extracted hereunder:-

''4 Later, in Indore Development Authority

v. Shyam Verma (SLP No. 9798 of 2016) considered it appropriate to refer the matter to Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India to refer the issues to be resolved by a larger Bench at the earliest. Yet again in State of Haryana v. Maharana Pratap Charitable Trust (Regd) (CA No. 4835 of 2015) referred the matter to Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India to constitute an appropriate Bench for consideration of the larger issue. These batch appeals were referred to a five Judge Bench, which after hearing counsel, framed the following questions, which arise for consideration:

"1. What is the meaning of the expression paid'/tender' in Section 24 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (Act of 2013') and Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, LA (Act of 1894')? Whether non-deposit of compensation in court under section 31(2) of the Act of 1894 results into lapse of acquisition under section 24(2) of the Act of 2013. What are the consequences of non-deposit in Court especially when compensation has been tendered and refused under section 31(1) of the Act of 1894 and section 24(2) of the Act of 2013? Whether such persons after refusal can take advantage of their wrong/conduct?

2. Whether the word or' should be read as conjunctive or disjunctive in Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013?

3. What is the true effect of the proviso, does it form part of sub-Section (2) or main Section 24 of the Act of 2013?

4. What is mode of taking possession under the Land Acquisition Act and true meaning of expression the physical possession of the land has not been taken occurring in Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013?

5. Whether the period covered by an interim order of a Court concerning land acquisition proceedings ought to be excluded for the purpose of applicability of Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 ?

6. Whether Section 24 of the Act of 2013 revives barred and stale claims? In addition, question of per incuriam and other incidental questions also to be gone into."

5. Question nos. 1 to 3 are interconnected and concern the correct interpretation of Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013. Following questions are required to be gone into to interpret the provisions of Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013:

(i) Whether the word "or" in Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 used in between possession has not been taken or compensation has not been paid to be read as "and"?

(ii) Whether proviso to Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 has to be construed as part thereof or proviso to Section 24(1) (b)?

(iii) What meaning is to be given to the word "paid" used in Section 24(2) and "deposited" used in the proviso to Section 24(2)?

(iv) What are the consequences of payment not made?

(v) What are the consequences of the amount not deposited?

(vi) What is the effect of a person refusing to accept the compensation?'

(25) These questions were answered by the Constitution Bench at paragraph No.402 of the judgment and the same is extracted hereunder:-

'402. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we answer the questions as under:

1. Under the provisions of Section 24(1) (a) in case the award is not made as on 1.1.2014 the date of commencement of Act of 2013, there is no lapse of proceedings. Compensation has to be determined under the provisions of Act of 2013.

2. In case the award has been passed within the window period of five years excluding the period covered by an interim

order of the court, then proceedings shall continue as provided under Section 24(1) (b) of the Act of 2013 under the Act of 1894 as if it has not been repealed.

3. The word 'or' used in Section 24(2) between possession and compensation has to be read as 'nor' or as 'and'. The deemed lapse of land acquisition proceedings under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 takes place where due to inaction of authorities for five years or more prior to commencement of the said Act, the possession of land has not been taken nor compensation has been paid. In other words, in case possession has been taken, compensation has not been paid then there is no lapse. Similarly, if compensation has been paid, possession has not been taken then there is no lapse.

4. The expression 'paid' in the main part of Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 does not include a deposit of compensation in court. The consequence of non-deposit is provided in proviso to Section 24(2) in case it has not been deposited with respect to majority of land holdings then all beneficiaries (landowners) as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the Act of 1894 shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the Act of 2013. In case the obligation under Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act of 1894 has not been fulfilled, interest under Section 34 of the said Act can be granted. Non-deposit of compensation (in court) does not result in the lapse of land acquisition proceedings. In case of non-deposit with respect to the majority of holdings for five years or more, compensation under the Act of 2013 has to be paid to the "landowners" as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the Act of 1894.

5. In case a person has been tendered the compensation as provided under Section 31 (1) of the Act of 1894, it is not open to him to claim that acquisition has lapsed

under Section 24(2) due to non-payment or non-deposit of compensation in court. The obligation to pay is complete by tendering the amount under Section 31(1). Land owners who had refused to accept compensation or who sought reference for higher compensation, cannot claim that the acquisition proceedings had lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013.

6. The proviso to Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 is to be treated as part of Section 24(2) not part of Section 24(1) (b).

7. The mode of taking possession under the Act of 1894 and as contemplated under Section 24(2) is by drawing of inquest report/memorandum. Once award has been passed on taking possession under Section 16 of the Act of 1894, the land vests in State there is no divesting provided under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, as once possession has been taken there is no lapse under Section 24(2).

8. The provisions of Section 24(2) providing for a deemed lapse of proceedings are applicable in case authorities have failed due to their inaction to take possession and pay compensation for five years or more before the Act of 2013 came into force, in a proceeding for land acquisition pending with concerned authority as on 1.1.2014. The period of subsistence of interim orders passed by court has to be excluded in the computation of five years.

9. Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 does not give rise to new cause of action to question the legality of concluded proceedings of land acquisition. Section 24 applies to a proceeding pending on the date of enforcement of the Act of 2013, i.e., 1.1.2014. It does not revive stale and time-barred claims and does not reopen concluded proceedings nor allow landowners to question the legality of mode of taking possession to reopen proceedings or mode of deposit of compensation in the treasury

instead of court to invalidate acquisition.'

(26) For the purpose of deciding the issue in the present writ petition, Clauses [3], [4], [5], [7] and [9] at paragraph No.402 requires proper understanding.

(27) The Hon'ble Supreme Court, while clarifying the purport of the word 'or ' used in Section 24[2] of the Act, held that it has to be read as 'nor' or as 'and'. Therefore, any person who wants to claim the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act, must satisfy both the requirements of taking possession as well as payment of compensation and mere fulfillment of one of the conditions will not render the acquisition proceedings lapsed.

(28) There are four important issues which requires consideration in the present writ petitions and they are [a] whether the physical possession of the subject properties was taken by the State from the owners of the properties? ; [b] whether the compensation has been paid by the State to the owners of the properties? ; [c] whether the petitioners are trying to reopen / revive concluded proceedings ? ; and [d] whether the petitioners have come to this Court at a belated stage seeking for the relief under Section 24[2] of the Act and ought to have challenged the illegality in taking possession or payment of compensation at the contemporaneous time?

(29) In order to understand the first issue with regard to taking of physical possession, it is important to unravel from the judgment of the Constitution Bench and find out what act of the State constitutes taking possession from the owner of the property. For this purpose, the relevant portions in the judgment are extracted hereunder:-

'278. Section 16 of the Act of 1894 provided that possession of land may be taken by the State Government after passing of an award and thereupon land vest free from all encumbrances in the State Government. Similar are the provisions made in the case of urgency in Section 17(1). The word "possession" has been used in the Act of 1894, whereas in Section 24 (2) of Act of 2013, the expression "physical possession" is used. It is submitted that drawing of panchnama for taking over the possession is not enough when the actual physical possession remained with the landowner and Section 24(2) requires actual physical possession to be taken, not the possession in any other form. When the State has acquired the land and award has been passed, land vests in the State Government free from all encumbrances. The act of vesting of the land in the State is

with possession, any person retaining the possession, thereafter, has to be treated as trespasser and has no right to possess the land which vests in the State free from all encumbrances.

279. The question which arises whether there is any difference between taking possession under the Act of 1894 and the expression "physical possession" used in Section 24(2). As a matter of fact, what was contemplated under the Act of 1894, by taking the possession meant only physical possession of the land. Taking over the possession under the Act of 2013 always amounted to taking over physical possession of the land. When the State Government acquires land and draws up a memorandum of taking possession, that amounts to taking the physical possession of the land. On the large chunk of property or otherwise which is acquired, the Government is not supposed to put some other person or the police force in possession to retain it and start cultivating it till the land is used by it for the purpose for which it has been acquired. The Government is not supposed to start residing or to physically occupy it once possession has been taken by drawing the inquest proceedings for obtaining possession thereof. Thereafter, if any further retaining of land or any re-entry is made on the land or someone starts cultivation on the open land or starts residing in the outhouse, etc., is deemed to be the trespasser on land which is in possession of the State. The possession of trespasser always inures for the benefit of the real owner that is the State Government in the case.

287. Under section 16 of the Act of 1894, vesting of title in the Government, in the land took place immediately upon taking possession. Under Sections 16 and 17 of the Act of 1894, the acquired land became the property of the State without any condition or limitation either as to title or possession. Absolute title thus vested in the State.

292. The word 'vest' has to be construed in the context in which it is used in a particular provision of the Act. Vesting is absolute and free from all encumbrances that includes possession. Once there is vesting of land, once possession has been taken, section 24(2) does

not contemplate divesting of the property from the State as mentioned above.

293. Now, the court would examine the mode of taking possession under the Act of 1894 as laid down by this Court. In Balwant Narayan Bhagde (supra) it was observed that the act of Tehsildar in going on the spot and inspecting the land was sufficient to constitute taking of possession. Thereafter, it would not be open to the Government or the Commission to withdraw from the acquisition under Section 48(1) of the Act. It was held thus:

"28. We agree with the conclusion reached by our brother Untwalia, J., as also with the reasoning on which the conclusion is based. But we are writing a separate judgment as we feel that the discussion in the judgment of our learned Brother Untwalia, J., in regard to delivery of "symbolical" and "actual" possession under Rules 35, 36, 95 and 96 of Order 21 of the Code of Civil Procedure, is not necessary for the disposal of the present appeals and we do not wish to subscribe to what has been said by our learned Brother Untwalia, J., in that connection, nor do we wish to express our assent with the discussion of the various authorities made by him in his judgment. We think it is enough to state that when the Government proceeds to take possession of the land acquired by it under the Land Acquisition Act, LA, it must take actual possession of the land since all interests in the land are sought to be acquired by it. There can be no question of taking "symbolical" possession in the sense understood by judicial decisions under the Code of Civil Procedure. Nor would possession merely on paper be enough. What the Act contemplates as a necessary condition of vesting of the land in the Government is the taking of actual possession of the land. How such possession may be taken would depend on the nature of the land. Such possession would have to be taken as the nature of the land admits of. There can be no hard and fast rule laying down what act would be sufficient to constitute taking of

possession of land. We should not, therefore, be taken as laying down an absolute and inviolable rule that merely going on the spot and making a declaration by beat of drum or otherwise would be sufficient to constitute taking of possession of land in every case. But here, in our opinion, since the land was lying fallow and there was no crop on it at the material time, the act of the Tehsildar in going on the spot and inspecting the land for the purpose of determining what part was waste and arable and should, therefore, be taken possession of and determining its extent, was sufficient to constitute taking of possession. It appears that the appellant was not present when this was done by the Tehsildar, but the presence of the owner or the occupant of the land is not necessary to effectuate the taking of possession. It is also not strictly necessary as a matter of legal requirement that notice should be given to the owner or the occupant of the land that possession would be taken at a particular time, though it may be desirable where possible, to give such notice before possession is taken by the authorities, as that would eliminate the possibility of any fraudulent or collusive transaction of taking of mere paper possession, without the occupant or the owner ever coming to know of it."

294. In Tamil Nadu Housing Board v. A. Viswam (supra) it was held that drawing of Panchnama in the presence of witnesses would constitute a mode of taking possession. This court observed:

"9. It is settled law by series of judgments of this Court that one of the accepted modes of taking possession of the acquired land is recording of a memorandum or Panchnama by the LAO in the presence of witnesses signed by him/them and that would constitute taking possession of the land as it would be impossible to take physical possession of the acquired land. It is common knowledge that in some cases

the owner/interested person may not cooperate in taking possession of the land."

(emphasis supplied)

295. In Banda Development Authority (supra) this Court held that preparing a Panchnama is sufficient to take possession. This Court has laid down thus:

"37. The principles which can be culled out from the above noted judgments are:

(i) No hard-and-fast rule can be laid down as to what act would constitute taking of possession of the acquired land.

(ii) If the acquired land is vacant, the act of the State authority concerned to go to the spot and prepare a panchnama will ordinarily be treated as sufficient to constitute taking of possession.

(iii) If crop is standing on the acquired land or building/structure exists, mere going on the spot by the authority concerned will, by itself, be not sufficient for taking possession. Ordinarily, in such cases, the authority concerned will have to give notice to the occupier of the building/structure or the person who has cultivated the land and take possession in the presence of independent witnesses and get their signatures on the panchnama. Of course, refusal of the owner of the land or building/structure may not lead to an inference that the possession of the acquired land has not been taken.

(iv) If the acquisition is of a large tract of land, it may not be possible for the acquiring/designated authority to take physical possession of each and every parcel of the land and it will be sufficient that symbolic possession is taken by preparing appropriate document in the presence of independent witnesses and getting their signatures on such document.

(v) If beneficiary of the acquisition is an agency/instrumentality of the State and 80% of the total compensation is deposited in terms of Section 17(3-A) and substantial portion of the acquired land has been utilised in furtherance of the particular public purpose, then the court may reasonably presume that possession of the acquired land has been taken."

305. In the decision in *Raghubir Singh Sehrawat v. State of Haryana* 178, the observation made was that it is not possible to take the possession of entire land in a day on which the award was declared, cannot be accepted as laying down the law correctly and same is contrary to a large number of precedents. The decision in *Narmada Bachao Andolan v. State of M.P.* 179, is confined to particular facts of the case. The Commissioner was appointed to find out possession on the spot. DVDs and CDs were seen to hold that the landowners were in possession. The District Judge, Indore, recorded the statements of the tenure-holder. We do not approve the method of determining the possession by appointment of Commissioner or by DVDs and CDs as an acceptable mode of proving taking of possession. The drawing of Panchnama contemporaneously is sufficient and it is not open to a court Commissioner to determine the factum of possession within the purview of Order XXVII, Rule 9 CPC. Whether possession has been taken, or not, is not a matter that a court appointed Commissioner cannot opine. However, drawing of Panchnama by itself is enough and is a proof of the fact that possession has been taken.

311. The court is alive to the fact that there are a large number of cases where, after acquisition land has been handed over to various corporations, local authorities, acquiring bodies, etc. After depositing compensation (for the acquisition) those bodies and authorities have been handed possession of lands. They, in turn, after development of such acquired lands have handed over properties; third party interests have intervened and now declaration is sought under the cover of section 24(2) to invalidate all such actions. As held by us, section 24 does not intend to cover such cases

at all and such gross misuse of the provisions of law must stop. Title once vested, cannot be obliterated, without an express legal provision; in any case, even if the landowners' argument that after possession too, in case of non-payment of compensation, the acquisition would lapse, were for arguments' sake, be accepted, these third party owners would be deprived of their lands, lawfully acquired by them, without compensation of any sort. Thus, we have no hesitation to overrule the decisions in Velaxan Kumar (supra) and Narmada Bachao Andolan (supra), with regard to mode of taking possession. We hold that drawing of Panchnama of taking possession is the mode of taking possession in land acquisition cases, thereupon land vests in the State and any re-entry or retaining the possession thereafter is unlawful and does not inure for conferring benefits under section 24(2) of the Act of 2013.

- (30) A close reading of all the above portions culled out from the judgment, clearly point out the fact that drawing of Panchnama of taking possession is the correct mode of taking possession in land acquisition cases, more particularly where the property acquired is a vacant land or a large tract of land. Taking possession by adopting to this mode, gives a lot of authenticity to prove that the land has been taken possession. Under the Transfer of Property Act, in cases of vacant land, possession always follow title. However, in the land acquisition proceedings, it works the other way round and here the title vests with the State only after taking possession. In other words, title follows possession. This position is very clear on a bare reading of Section 16 of the 1894 Act.
- (31) While applying the above principles to the facts of the present case, it is seen that the only document that is available in order to prove the taking of possession is the Possession Certificate dated 14.08.2006 issued by the Assistant Grade Revenue Inspector, O/o. The Special Tahsildar [LA], Housing Scheme, to the Surveyor of the O/o. The Executive Engineer and Administrative Officer, Coimbatore Housing Unit. This is the document that has been produced evidencing the handing over of the property by the revenue to the Requisitioning Body, viz., the TNHB. Even in paragraph No.7 of the counter affidavit filed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, this is the only document relied upon by the respondents to prove taking of possession.
- (32) The State Government has not filed any counter affidavit in the present case. There is no material available and nowhere any statement has been made as to when the State took

possession of the properties from the land owners. The insistence made under Section 24[2] of the Act as well as the judgment of the Constitution Bench is with regard to taking of possession by the State from the land owners. The handing over of possession by Acquiring Body to the Requisitioning Body may not be very relevant for this purpose since it is an internal document between two Departments. This handing over of the properties to the Requisitioning Body will happen only after the possession is taken by the State from the owners of the lands and therefore, it is more consequential in nature.

(33) Unfortunately, in this case, the learned Advocate General made a very shocking revelation during the course of hearing that the entire original records have gone missing and it is not traceable. This reveals the shocking state of affairs on the side of the respondents and it is not known whether the original records are genuinely missing or it has gone missing due to the intervention of some human agency. Due to the non-availability of the original records, this Court is not in a position to ascertain as to when the State had taken possession of the properties from the land owners and the mode that was adopted for taking possession. In the absence of the State not filing any counter and not coming out with a clear stand as to when the possession was taken from the land owners and the mode that was adopted for taking possession, this Court is not in a position to satisfy itself with regard to the taking of possession of the property by the State from the land owners.

(34) In order to understand the second issue with regard to payment of compensation by the State to the owners of the properties, it is important to unravel from the judgment of the Constitution Bench and find out as to when it constitutes tendering/paying/depositing compensation. For this purpose, the relevant portions in the judgment are extracted hereunder:-

''229. Section 24(2) deals with the expression where compensation has not been paid. It would mean that it has not been tendered for payment under section 31(1). Though the word 'paid' amounts to a completed event however once payment of compensation has been offered/tendered under section 31(1), the acquiring authority cannot be penalized for non-payment as the amount has remained unpaid due to refusal to accept, by the landowner and Collector is prevented from making the payment. Thus, the word 'paid' used in section 24(2) cannot be said to include within its ken 'deposit' under section 31(2). For that special provision has been carved out in the proviso to section 24(2), which deals with the amount to be deposited in the account of beneficiaries. Two different expressions have been used in section

24. In the main part of section 24, the word 'paid' and in its proviso 'deposited' have been used.

255. The land owners had argued that the obligation to pay gets discharged only when compensation is actually paid and/or deposited. Even if it is received under protest under Section 31(1), it is finally accepted by the landowners post-settlement by the Reference Court. We are not able to accept the submission as Section 34 of the Act of 1894, is clear even if the amount is not paid or deposited, it carries interest. The logic behind this is that if the State is retaining the amount with peace and its liability to pay does not cease, but it would be liable to make the payment with interest as envisaged therein. Once tender is made, obligation to pay is fulfilled so that the amount cannot be said to have been paid, but obligation to pay has been discharged and if a person who has not accepted it, cannot penalise the other party for default to pay and non-deposit carries only interest as money had been retained with the Government.

256. Thus, in our opinion, the word "paid" used in Section 24(2) does not include within its meaning the word "deposited", which has been used in the proviso to Section 24(2). Section 31 of the Act of 1894, deals with the deposit as envisaged in Section 31(2) on being 'prevented' from making the payment even if the amount has been deposited in the treasury under the Rules framed under Section 55 or under the Standing Orders, that would carry the interest as envisaged under Section 34, but acquisition would not lapse on such deposit being made in the treasury. In case amount has been tendered and the landowner has refused to receive it, it cannot be said that the liability arising from non-payment of the amount is that of lapse of acquisition. Interest would follow in such a case also due to non-deposit of the amount. Equally, when the landowner does not accept the amount, but seeks a reference for higher compensation, there can be no question of such individual stating that he was not paid the amount (he was determined to be entitled to by the collector). In such case, the landowner would be entitled to the compensation determined by the Reference court.'

(35)The conclusion of the above findings culminates at Clause [4] in paragraph No.402 of the judgment. Once the compensation amount is tendered to the land owner, as provided under Section 31[1] of the Act, the obligation to pay gets fulfilled. If it is refused to be received by the land owner, that cannot be put against the State and that will not amount to non-payment of the compensation amount. Again, where the compensation is refused to be received and the land owner seeks for enhancement of compensation, that will also not amount to non-payment of compensation. Section 31[2] of the Act provides different situations where the compensation tendered by the State does not actually reach the land owner under the following circumstances:-

- i.If the land owner does not consent or receive it ;
- ii.No competent person having title is available to receive the compensation ;
- iii.There is dispute as to title over the property among various persons claiming right over the property ; and
- iv.There is dispute with regard to the apportionment of compensation among the co-owners of the property.

In all the above four contingencies, the District Collector will have to deposit the amount of compensation in the Court to which a reference under Section 18 of the Act is normally preferred.

(36)The Hon'ble Supreme Court also dealt with the deposit of the amount in the Treasury Account. The Apex Court took note of the Rules framed and the Standing Orders issued by various State Governments in this regard. The Hon'ble Supreme Court specifically took into consideration the effect of such Treasury deposit that is prevalent in the State of Punjab and the relevant portions are extracted hereunder:-

''257.It was urged on behalf of acquiring Authorities that various State Governments have framed rules under Section 55 of the Act of 1894 and/or have issued the Standing Orders/instructions with respect to the Government money under Article 283 of the Constitution of India. These Standing Orders and Rules have remained in force from time immemorial; their provisions require the amount to be tendered, notice to be issued to the landowners to collect the amount of compensation awarded to them. If they do not appear and apply to the reference under Section 18, the officer shall cause the amounts due to be paid into the treasury as revenue deposits payable to the persons to whom they are respectively due and vouched for in the accompanying form (marked E).

.....

260.Standing Order No. 28 was issued in

1909 by the State of Punjab and was applicable to Delhi also, which provided five modes of payment in para 74 and 75 thus:

"74. Methods of making payments.—There are five methods of making payments:

- (1) By direct payments, see Para 75(I) infra
- (2) By order on treasury, see Para 75(II) infra
- (3) By money order, see Para 75(III) infra
- (4) By cheque, see Para 75(IV) infra
- (5) By deposit in a treasury, see Para 75(V) infra

75. Direct payments.—

(V) By treasury deposit.— In giving notice of the award under Section 12(2) and tendering payment under Section 31(1) to such of the persons interested as were not present personally or by their representatives when the award was made, the officer shall require them to appear personally or by representatives by a certain date to receive payment of the compensation awarded to them, intimating also that no interest will be allowed to them if they fail to appear, if they do not appear and do not apply for a reference to the civil court under Section 18, the officer shall after any further endeavours to secure their attendance that may seem desirable, cause the amounts due to be paid to the treasury as revenue deposits payable to the persons to whom they are respectively due and vouched for in the form marked E below. The officer shall also give notice to the payees of such deposits, specifying the treasury in which the deposit has been made. When the payees ultimately claim payment of sums placed in deposit, the amounts will be paid to them in the same manner as ordinary revenue deposit. The officer should, as far as possible, arrange to make the payments due in or near the village to which the payee belong in order that the number of undisbursed sums to be placed in deposits on account of non-attendance may be reduced to a minimum. Whenever payment is claimed through a representative whether before or after deposit of the amount awarded, such representative, must

have legal authority for receiving the compensation on behalf of his principal."

|                                                                                                                                                                             |  |  |  |  |                                                                                                                                                                             |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Form E                                                                                                                                                                      |  |  |  |  | Form E                                                                                                                                                                      |  |  |  |  |
| Name of Work for which land has been acquired                                                                                                                               |  |  |  |  | Name of Work for which land has been acquired                                                                                                                               |  |  |  |  |
| To the officer incharge of _____ Treasury                                                                                                                                   |  |  |  |  | To the officer incharge of _____ Treasury                                                                                                                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Please receive for transfer to credit of revenue deposit the sum of Rs. _____ on account of compensation for land taken up for the above purpose payable as detailed below: |  |  |  |  | Please receive for transfer to credit of revenue deposit the sum of Rs. _____ on account of compensation for land taken up for the above purpose payable as detailed below: |  |  |  |  |

| Sl.No in Award Statement No. | Name of persons to whom due | Area of land | Amount payable to each | Remarks |  | Name of persons to whom due | Area of land | Amount payable to each | Remarks |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|--|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------|
|                              |                             | Acr es       | Rs.                    |         |  |                             | Acres        | Rs.                    |         |

Total \_\_\_\_\_

Total \_\_\_\_\_

Land acquisition Officer  
Acquisition Officer

Land

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Received the above amount and credited to Revenue Account.<br>Treasury Officer<br>NOTE:-This Form should be used when the amounts of compensation due are sent to Treasury in the absence of proprietors, who have failed to present themselves for payment. | Received the above amount and credited to Revenue Account.<br>Treasury Officer<br>NOTE:-This Form should be used when the amounts of compensation due are sent to Treasury in the absence of proprietors, who have failed to present themselves for payment. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

261.Sub-para (V) of the above made it clear that payment is credited to the treasury when a person who is served with a notice under Section 12(2) of the Act of 1894, is not present and the

award is passed. When a notice is given to receive the payment of compensation and in case they fail to appear, the amount has to be paid to the treasury as revenue deposit payable to the landowner.

262. Rules and the Standing Orders are binding on the concerned Authorities and they have to follow them. They deposit the amounts in court only when a reference (for higher compensation) is sought, not otherwise. Even if a person refuses to accept it and the amount is deposited in court or even it is not tendered, only higher interest follows under Section 34. Once Rules have prevailed since long and even if it is assumed that deposit in court is mandatory on being prevented from payment as envisaged under Section 31(1), the only liability to make the payment of higher interest is fastened upon the State. The liability to pay the amount with interest would subsist. When amounts are deposited in court, there would occur a procedural irregularity and the adverse consequence envisaged is under Section 34 of the Act of 1894. The consequence of non-deposit in the court is that the amount of the landowner cannot be invested in the Government securities as envisaged under Sections 32 and 33 of the Act of 1894, in which interest is not more 15 per cent. Thus, no prejudice is caused to the landowners rather they stand to gain and still payment is safe as it is kept in the court. We have already held that there is a distinction between the expression "paid" and "deposited", thus the amount being deposited as per Rules in the treasury or as per the Standing Orders considering the scheme of Section 31 read with Section 34 of the Act of 1894, which are pari materia to Sections 77 and 80 of the Act of 2013. We are of the considered opinion that acquisition cannot be invalidated, only higher compensation would follow in case amount has not been deposited with respect to majority of land holdings, all the beneficiaries would be entitled for higher compensation as envisaged in the proviso to Section 24(2).

263. Deposit in treasury in place of deposit in court causes no prejudice to the landowner or any other stakeholder as their interest is adequately safeguarded by the provisions

contained in Section 34 of the Act of 1894, as it ensures higher rate of interest than any other Government securities. Their money is safe and credited in the earmarked quantified amount and can be made available for disbursement to him/them. There is no prejudice caused and every infraction of law would not vitiate the act.'

(37) In the State of Tamil Nadu, the Board Standing Orders provides for three types of Treasury deposits, viz., [1] Deposits made in the District Treasury ; [2] Deposits made in the Huzur Treasury ; and [3] Deposits made in the Sub Treasury. Even in the State of Tamil Nadu, Appendix-II under Standing Order No.90 provides for the Rules for payment of compensation for lands taken up under the Land Acquisition Act. Rule 6 specifically deals with the procedure to be followed when the land owner does not appear after the notice of the Award is issued under Section 12[2] of the 1894 Act and payment is tendered under Section 31[1] of the 1894 Act and it provides that the amounts due to be paid to the land owner, can be deposited in the Treasury as revenue deposits under Form-E. This Form-E exactly coincides with the Form-E that was referred by the Hon'ble Apex Court while dealing with the Form that is available in the State of Punjab. After referring to the said Standing Orders/Rules, the Apex Court said that depositing in Treasury instead of depositing in Court will not cause any prejudice to the land owner and therefore, even such treasury deposit was taken to be a valid mode of tendering / paying compensation to the land owner.

(38) While applying the above principles to the facts of the present case, it is seen that the only document that is available to prove payment of compensation, is found at Page No.13 of the typed set of papers filed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent. The entire compensation amount covering the Award amount of all the land owners to the tune of Rs.38,83,496/- has been deposited in a Personal Deposit [PD] Account at the State Bank of India, Coimbatore. This amount has been deposited by the Special Tahsildar [LA], Housing Scheme Unit-1, Coimbatore. This deposit is not strictly in accordance with the Revenue Standing Orders which provides specifically Form-E. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, while referring to a very similar Form, has held that the Rules and Standing Orders are binding on the concerned authorities and they have to follow them, when they deposit the compensation amount in the revenue deposit. It is not even clear as to whether the deposit made under the head of Personal Deposit, will constitute a revenue deposit. The reason why such a doubt is entertained is because such revenue deposit must be made in the name of the respective land owners in Form-E and only then, it will amount to tendering / paying the compensation amount to the respective

land owners. For reasons best known to the respondents, the same has not been followed in the present case.

- (39) The Scheme of the 1894 Act shows that after the Award enquiry is concluded under Section 11 of the Act and the compensation is determined, Section 12[2] mandates the Collector to give immediate notice of his Award to such of the persons who are interested and who were not present personally or through their representatives when the Award was made. Even though a plea has been taken at paragraph No.8 of the counter affidavit to the effect that notified persons who appeared during the enquiry, refused to receive the compensation, the findings in the Award enquiry does not concur with this averment. It will therefore, be more beneficial to extract the portion of the Award proceedings dated 19.02.2001 dealing with the present writ petition:-

|             |             |
|-------------|-------------|
| SF.No.3/2A  | 0.64.5 Hec. |
| SF.No.4/3B1 | 0.21.0 Hec. |
| SF.No.4/3B2 | 0.01.0 Hec. |
|             | 0.86.5 Hec. |

Thiru R.Maruthachala Gounder, S/o.Ramana Gounder is the notified person to the above fields. He has been served with notice for award enquiry. He has not appeared for enquiry but the favour of him, his son Thiru.M.Ramasamy appeared for enquiry. He has stated that as per Patta No.228, the lands owned by the notified persons. No documentary evidence was produced in this regard. The lands are rain fed dry lands. It is further stated that the notified person has no other cultivated land except the lands proposed for acquisition. He has further stated that the notified person has approached the High Court, Madras to quash the LA Activities in WP.No.12250/99 dated 26.7.99 has obtained order of stay from the High Court, Madras for disposal of the writ petitions. Therefore, the entire amount of compensation due to be paid to the notified persons for the above fields is ordered to be deposited in the civil court under section 30 & 31[2] of the Land Acquisition Act.'

- (40) It is clear from the above that the son of the notified person appeared before the Collector and informed him that the acquisition proceedings have been challenged before the High Court, Madras and it is pending in WP.No.12250 of 1999 and there is also an order of stay of dispossession passed by the High Court. This information provided by the son of the notified person is construed as refusal to receive compensation by the respondents and therefore, the compensation amount has

been deposited in the manner referred supra. Neither the counter affidavit nor any other material produced before this Court, reveals as to whether any notice was issued under Section 12[2] of the Act after the conclusion of the Award proceedings under Section 11 of the 1894 Act. In the absence of any material, it must be taken that no such notice was issued to the land owner/notified person and straight away deposit has been resorted by the respondents.

(41) The next question is whether this deposit made by the respondents satisfies the requirement of tendering / paying the compensation to the land owner. The learned Advocate General submitted that even assuming without admitting that the respondents did not follow the correct procedure for deposit of the compensation amount, the same cannot be questioned at this length of time and it should have been questioned during the contemporaneous time at which it was deposited. In order to appreciate this submission made by the learned Advocate General, this Court must clearly enunciate as to what constitutes tendering / paying of compensation amount to a land owner after the compensation is fixed in the Award Proceedings under Section 11 of the 1894 Act.

(42) The term ''tendering of amount'' involves an offer made for payment of money to the person who is entitled to receive the same. That would mean that the Collector must be armed with the amount of compensation payable to the persons interested and sufficient notice must be given to them to assemble in a place in order to receive the compensation amount. It is only for this purpose, Section 12[2] of the 1894 Act provides for issuance of notice to the land owner after the Award enquiry and determination of compensation and if this notice is issued and the land owner, either refuses to receive this amount or does not appear even after the receipt of the notice, the revenue deposit made thereafter, will amount to a proper tendering/paying of the compensation amount. Even for the sake of arguments if the contention raised by the learned Advocate General that the deposit made without strictly following the Standing Orders will not vitiate the deposit, is taken as it is, that stage will be reached only if a notice is given to the land owner asking him to receive the compensation under Section 12[2] of the 1894 Act and admittedly, in the present case, no such notice has been issued to the land owners. Therefore, the land owners may not even be knowing that the compensation amount has been deposited in some account. When the State with its eminent domain powers, acquires the land of a person, it is the duty of the State to tender/pay the compensation by calling the owner of the property and the owner of the property is not expected to voluntarily go and stand before the authority with a begging bowl. This position of law has been made clear by the following judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India:-

(a) DDA V. Sukhbir Singh reported in 2016 [6] SCC 258 :  
2017 [5] SCC [Civ] 779 : 2016 SCC Online SC 929 at page 270  
and the relevant portion is extracted hereunder:-

''9. The scheme of the Land Acquisition Act, insofar as the making of award and the payment of compensation to persons interested, is as follows. On the day fixed, the Collector after the inquiry that is contemplated under Section 11, has to make an award which must contain the necessary ingredients mentioned in Section 11. As soon as the award is made, under Section 12(2) of the Act, the Collector is to give immediate notice of the award to such of the persons interested as are not present personally. This provision, when read with Section 31 of the Act, makes it clear that the statutory scheme is that the Collector is to tender payment of compensation awarded by him to the persons who are interested and entitled thereto, according to the award, on the date of making the award itself. It is, therefore, clear that under the statutory scheme, the Collector must be armed with the amount of compensation payable to persons interested as soon as the award is made. Such persons have to be paid the sum mentioned in the award, it being well settled that the award is only an offer which may be accepted or rejected by the claimants. If accepted, whether under protest or otherwise, it is the duty of the Collector to make payment as soon as possible after making the award. It is only in a situation where the persons interested refuse consent to receive monies payable, or there be no person competent to alienate the land, or if there be any dispute as to title to receive compensation or its apportionment, is the Collector to deposit the amount of compensation in the Reference Court. It is only after these steps have been taken that the Collector may take possession of the land, which shall thereupon vest absolutely in the Government free from all encumbrances. The Act further makes it clear, on a reading of Section 34, that where such compensation is neither paid or deposited on or before taking possession of the land, interest is payable @ 9% p.a. for one year and 15% p.a. thereafter. This is because a person becomes divested of both possession and title to his property without compensation having been paid or deposited, as the case may

be. This statutory scheme has been adverted to in some of the decisions of this Court."

The Court then considered the provisions of the Standing Orders applicable to the NCT of Delhi and observed as under :

17. Far from the aforesaid Standing Order coming to the assistance of the appellants, it is clear that the said Standing Order fleshes out Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act by insisting that compensation must be paid as soon as the award is announced, vide Para 71. Sufficient notice must be given to enable all payees to assemble at a place where they will receive their dues immediately. It is emphasised by the said paragraph that much trouble will be avoided if the principle that payment of compensation should be made at the time of the award, is strictly observed. Also, it is important that the authorities draw in advance a sum sufficient to cover the probable amount of the award and to make payments."

(b) The expression "tender" occurring in Section 31(2) was considered by a three judge Bench in Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra, (2018) 3 SCC 412. Arun Mishra, J has observed as under :

"Meaning of "paid" in Section 31 of the 1894 Act and Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act

34. The question arises what is the meaning of the expression "paid" in Section 24 and "tender" in Section 31(2) of the 1894 Act. Whether the tender of compensation amount to discharge of obligations to make payment. The meaning of expression "tender": is when a person has tendered the amount and made it unconditionally available and the landowner has refused to receive it, the person who has tendered the amount cannot be saddled with the liability, which is to be visited for non-payment of the amount. "Tender" has been defined in Black's Law Dictionary thus:

"tender, n. (16c) 1. A valid and sufficient offer of performance; specific, an unconditional offer of money or performance to satisfy a debt or obligation a tender of delivery. The tender may save the tendering party from a penalty for non-payment or non-performance or may, if the other party unjustifiably refuses the tender,

place the other party in default. Cf. offer or performance; consignment."

(emphasis supplied)

It is apparent from aforesaid that "tender" may save the tendering party from the penalty for non-payment or non-performance or penalty if another party unjustifiably refusing the tender, places the other party in default. A formal offer duly made by one party to another especially an offer of money in discharge of liability fulfils the terms of the law and of the liability. Tender is to offer money in satisfaction of a debt, by producing and showing the amount to a creditor or party claiming and expressing verbally, willingness to pay it. The expression "tender" has been used in Section 31. The concept of deposited in court is different from tender and "paid".

In his supplementing opinion Shantanagoudar, J has also adverted to the essentials of a valid "tender" in the following passage

"238. The definition of "tender" has been outlined by this Court in Tata Cellular v. Union of India [Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651] as follows: (SCC p. 675, para 69)

"69. A tender is an offer. It is something which invites and is communicated to notify acceptance. Broadly stated, the following are the requisites of a valid tender:

1. It must be unconditional.
2. Must be made at the proper place.
3. Must conform to the terms of obligation.
4. Must be made at the proper time.
5. Must be made in the proper form.
6. The person by whom the tender is made must be able and willing to perform his obligations.
7. There must be reasonable opportunity for inspection.
8. Tender must be made to the proper person.
9. It must be of full amount.

(43) It is clear from the above judgments that it is the duty of the Collector to make payment by issuing proper notice to the concerned land owner and calling him to receive the compensation amount. Unless this crucial step is followed, the land owner may not even know whether it was deposited and if so, when the amount was deposited. Even if a notified person

or his representative participates in the Award proceedings, that will not amount to a presumption that he has the notice of the compensation amount being readily available for payment. That is why Section 12[2] of the 1894 Act specifically mandates issuance of such notice. If the notice is issued and thereafter, the land owner refuses to receive the compensation or does not come to the specified place to receive the compensation and the compensation amount gets deposited in a Treasury account or the Court, as the case may be, the land owner cannot be permitted to turn around at a later point of time and complain that the compensation amount was not tendered / paid to him.

(44) In the facts of the present case, the deposit made in the PD Account on 01.03.2001 by the Special Tahsildar [LA], Housing Scheme Unit 1, Coimbatore, does not amount to a valid tender/payment of compensation. This finding is given not by finding fault in the procedure adopted in the deposit of amount as per the Standing Orders, but based on the most crucial fact that there was no notice issued to the land owners after the Award Proceedings, under Section 12[2] of the 1894 Act and therefore, there was no valid tender/payment of the compensation to the land owners. The judgments cited supra and the judgment of the Constitution Bench clearly supports this finding on the issue of valid tender/payment of compensation.

(45) The third and fourth issues can be taken up together since they are in a sense, inter related. In order to properly understand the scope of these two issues, it is important to unravel the meaning assigned to the terms 'concluded proceedings' and 'revival of stale claims'. The relevant portions in the judgment of the Constitution Bench are extracted hereunder:-

'275 It is clear that once land is acquired, award passed and possession has been taken, it has vested in the State. It had been allotted to beneficiaries. A considerable infrastructure could have been developed and a third-party interest had also intervened. The land would have been given by the acquiring authorities to the beneficiaries from whose schemes the land had been acquired and they have developed immense infrastructure. We are unable to accept the submission that merely by deposit of amount in treasury instead of court, we should invalidate all the acquisitions, which have taken place. That is not what is contemplated under Section 24(2). We are also not able to accept the submission that when law operates these harsh consequences need not be seen by the court. In our opinion, that submission is without merit in as such

consequences are not even envisaged on proper interpretation of Section 24(2), as mentioned above.

276 The proviso to Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, intends that the Collector would have sufficient funds to deposit it with respect to the majority of landholdings. In case compensation has not been paid or deposited with respect to majority of land holdings, all the beneficiaries are entitled for higher compensation. In case money has not been deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector or in the treasury or in court with respect to majority of landholdings, the consequence has to follow of higher compensation as per proviso to Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013. Even otherwise, if deposit in treasury is irregular, then the interest would follow as envisaged under Section 34 of Act of 1894. Section 24(2) is attracted if acquisition proceeding is not completed within 5 years after the pronouncement of award. Parliament considered the period of 5 years as reasonable time to complete the acquisition proceedings i.e., taking physical possession of the land and payment of compensation. It is the clear intent of the Act of 2013, that provision of Section 24(2) shall apply to the proceeding which is pending as on the date on which the Act of 2013, has been brought into force and it does not apply to the concluded proceedings. It was urged before us by one of the Counsel that lands in the Raisina Hills and Lutyens' Zones of Delhi were acquired in 1913 and compensation has not been paid. The Act of 2013 applies only to the pending proceedings in which possession has not been taken or compensation has not paid and not to a case where proceedings have been concluded long back, Section 24(2) is not a tool to revive those proceedings and to question the validity of taking acquisition proceedings due to which possession in 1960s, 1970s, 1980s were taken, or to question the manner of deposit of amount in the treasury. The Act of 2013 never intended revival such claims. In case such landowners were interested in questioning the proceedings of taking possession or mode of deposit with the treasury, such a challenge was permissible within the time available with them to do so.

They cannot wake from deep slumber and raise such claims in order to defeat the acquisition validly made. In our opinion, the law never contemplates-nor permits-misuse much less gross abuse of its provisions to reopen all the acquisitions made after 1984, and it is the duty of the court to examine the details of such claims. There are several litigations before us where landowners, having lost the challenge to the validity of acquisition proceedings and after having sought enhancement of the amount in the reference succeeding in it nevertheless are seeking relief arguing about lapse of acquisition after several rounds of litigation.

277 The expression used in Section 24(1) (b) is 'where an award under Section 11 has been made', then 'such proceedings shall continue' under the provisions of the said Act of 1894 as if the said Act has not been repealed'. The expression "proceedings shall continue" indicates that proceedings are pending at the time; it is a present perfect tense and envisages that proceedings must be pending as on the date on which the Act of 2013 came into force. It does not apply to concluded proceedings before the Collector after which it becomes functus officio. Section 24 of the Act of 2013, does not confer benefit in the concluded proceedings, of which legality if question has to be seen in the appropriate proceedings. It is only in the pending proceedings where award has been passed and possession has not been taken nor compensation has been paid, it is applicable. There is no lapse in case possession has been taken, but amount has not been deposited with respect to majority of land holdings in a pending proceeding, higher compensation under the Act of 2013 would follow under the proviso to Section 24(2). Thus, the provision is not applicable to any other case in which higher compensation has been sought by way of seeking a reference under the Act of 1894 or where the validity of the acquisition proceedings have been questioned, though they have been concluded. Such case has to be decided on their own merits and the provisions of Section 24(2) are not applicable to such cases.

.....

374 Before proceeding further, in our opinion, Section 24 contemplates pending proceedings and not the concluded ones in which possession has been taken, and compensation has been paid or deposited. Section 24 does not provide an arm or tool to question the legality of proceedings, which have been undertaken under the Act of 1894 and stood concluded before five years or more. It is only in cases where possession has not been taken, nor compensation is paid, that there is a lapse. In case possession has been taken, and compensation has not been deposited with respect to majority of landholdings, the beneficial provision of the statute provides that all beneficiaries shall be paid compensation as admissible under the Act of 2013. The beneficiaries, i.e., landowners contemplated under the proviso to Section 24(2), are the ones who were so recorded as beneficiaries as on the date of issuance of notification under Section 4 of the Act of 1894. The provision is not meant to be invoked on the basis of void transactions, and by the persons who have purchased on the basis of power of attorney or otherwise, they cannot claim the benefit under Section 24 as is apparent from proviso to Section 24(2) and the decision in Shiv Kumar v. Union of India<sup>228</sup>.

375 This Court is cognizant that Section 24 is used for submitting various claims, by way of filing applications in the pending proceedings either before the High Court or this Court. There are cases in which in the first round of litigation where the challenge to acquisition proceedings has failed, validity has been upheld, and possession has been taken after passing of the award. It is contended that drawing of panchnama was not the permissible mode to take possession, and actual physical possession remains with such landowners/purchasers/power of attorney holders as such benefit of Section 24 should be given to them notwithstanding the fact that they have withdrawn the compensation also.

376 This Court is cognizant of cases where reference was sought for enhancement of

compensation, money was deposited in the treasury, enhancement was made, and possession was taken. Yet, acquisitions have been questioned, and claims are being made under Section 24, that acquisition has lapsed, as the deposit (of compensation amount) in the treasury was not in accordance with the law, the amount should have been deposited in reference court. Further, this Court also notes that there have been cases in which after taking possession, when development is complete, infrastructure has developed despite which claims are being made under Section 24, on the ground that either the possession has not been taken in accordance with law or compensation has been deposited in the treasury, thus questioning the acquisitions. The decision in *Mahavir v. Union of India*<sup>229</sup> was an instance in which a claim was made that acquisition was made more than a century ago, and compensation has not been paid as such acquisition has lapsed relating to the land of Raisina Hills in New Delhi. The importance of Raisina Hills is well-known to everybody. The grossest misuse of Section 24 has been sought to be made, which is intended to confer benefit. It was never intended to revive such claims and be used in the manner in which it has been today, where large numbers of acquisitions and development projects, such as construction of roads, hospitals, townships, housing projects, etc., are sought to be undone, though such acquisitions have been settled in several rounds of litigation. In several matters, the validity has been questioned under the guise as if the right has been conferred for the first time under the Act of 2013, claiming that such acquisitions have lapsed. There are also cases in which the claims for release of land under Section 48 of the Act of 1894 have been dismissed. Now, claims are made that as land is open and landowners/intermediaries/POA holders continue to be in physical possession, thus, it should be returned to them, as the acquisition has lapsed under Section 24(2). Before us also arguments have been raised to grant relief in all such cases by making purposive interpretation of benevolent provisions. It was urged that this Court is bound to give relief as Section 24 is retrospective in operation, and the authorities have not cared to take

possession for more than five years or more, and they have not paid the compensation and deposited it in treasury which cannot be said to be legal. It is declared that the acquisition has lapsed, and the land is given back to them. In case any infrastructure is existing, the State Government should acquire the land afresh after following the process of Act of 2013. Earlier, injustice was done to landowners, as observed in various decisions mentioned above. We should not disturb the decisions of this Court and are bound to follow the law laid down in Pune Municipal Corporation (supra) and the principle of stare decisis.

380 Section 24(2) is sought to be used as an umbrella so as to question the concluded proceedings in which possession has been taken, development has been made, and compensation has been deposited, but may be due to refusal, it has not been collected. The challenge to the acquisition proceedings cannot be made within the parameters of Section 24(2) once panchnama had been drawn of taking possession, thereafter re-entry or retaining the possession is that of the trespasser. The legality of the proceedings cannot be challenged belatedly, and the right to challenge cannot be revived by virtue of the provisions of Section 24(2). Section 24(2) only contemplates lethargy/inaction of the authorities to act for five years or more. It is very easy to lay a claim that physical possession was not taken, with respect to open land. Yet, once vesting takes place, possession is presumed to be that of the owner, i.e., the State Government and land has been transferred to the beneficiaries, Corporations, Authorities, etc., for developmental purposes and third-party interests have intervened. Such challenges cannot be entertained at all under the purview of Section 24(2) as it is not what is remotely contemplated in Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013.'

The above discussion on these issues ultimately culminates into an answer at clause [9] of paragraph No.402 which has already been extracted supra.

(46)A careful reading of the above findings of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India clearly points out to the fact that the term ''concluded proceedings'' will take within its fold

Section 4[1] Notification, Section 6 Declaration, Section 11 - Award proceedings, Section 12 - Notice of the Award to the persons notified or their representative, Section 31 - payment of compensation or Section 32 - deposit in the Court, Section 16 - taking of possession. Once all this process is complete and the land ultimately vests with the State absolutely under Section 16 of the 1894 Act, the same will be construed to be conclusive proceedings. The Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in more than one place, has categorically held that such concluded proceedings cannot be permitted to be reopened and Section 24[2] of the Act cannot be used as a tool to revive those proceedings and to question the validity of the same. The Hon'ble Supreme Court gives various instances where the lands are acquired and thereafter it is handed over to the Requisitioning Body and the project also starts or in some cases where the land owners have sought for a reference for higher compensation and thereafter turned around to take advantage of Section 24[2] of the Act and in all those instances, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has come down very heavily and said that Section 24[2] of the Act should not be allowed to be misused and no land owner should be permitted to revive concluded proceedings.

(47) The observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and which has been extracted supra, also makes it very clear that stale claims should never be allowed to be made by taking advantage of Section 24[2] of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court quotes the instance of a claim that was made for an acquisition that took place a century ago and for which, it was alleged that no compensation was paid. The Hon'ble Supreme Court also took into consideration cases where, after the acquisition of the property development projects such as construction of roads, hospitals, townships, housing projects etc., are sought to be undone even after such acquisitions have been settled in several rounds of litigations earlier. The Hon'ble Supreme Court said that Section 24[2] of the Act does not confer any new right and thereby, stale claims cannot be revived.

(48) This Court will now apply the above principles to the facts of the present case and see if the petitioners are attempting to reopen concluded proceedings or reviving any stale claims. It is true that the acquisition proceedings came to be challenged before this Court after Section 6 - Declaration by filing WP.No.12250 of 1999. One of the writ petitioners in the said writ petition is late Marudhachala Gounder, who is the father of the petitioners. The writ petition was dismissed by an order dated 27.12.2004 and the Division Bench confirmed this order in WA.No.835 of 2007 by an order dated 27.06.2007. The learned Advocate General, by pointing out to these two orders, submitted that the petitioners are completely aware about the

acquisition proceedings and they are also aware about the deposit of compensation and also taking possession of the subject property and therefore, once the title has vested in the State under Section 16 of the 1894 Act, the petitioners cannot be permitted to reopen such concluded proceedings. There is no controversy from both sides with regard to the meaning to be assigned to the term ''concluded proceedings''. What this term means has been explained by this Court hereinabove. This Court, while dealing with the issue of taking possession of the subject property and tendering / payment of compensation, has categorically held that both these conditions have not been satisfied in the facts of the present case. The dismissal of the writ petition which was subsequently confirmed in the writ appeal, confined itself only to Section 4[1] - Notification and Section 6 - Declaration and nothing further. The award proceedings under Section 11, issuance of notice under Section 12[2], payment / deposit of compensation under Section 31 or 32 and taking of possession under Section 16 of the 1894 Act has never come up for consideration at any point of time or challenged in any other proceedings and therefore, the mere dismissal of the writ petition which was confirmed in the writ appeal, cannot be construed as reopening of concluded proceedings.

(49)The learned Advocate General vehemently argued that the petitioners have knocked the doors of this Court at a very belated stage and are claiming the benefits of Section 24[2] of the Act. He would further contend that the cause of action for the petitioners to have taken the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act arose immediately after the 2013 Act came into force with effect from 01.01.2014. The petitioners never chose to file any writ petition before this Court seeking for the benefit of Section 24[2] of the Act. They have filed the present writ petition after nearly six years after the 2013 Act came into force. Therefore, the learned Advocate General would submit that the claims made by the petitioners has become stale and it is hit by laches and there is an unexplained and inordinate delay in approaching this Court and therefore, this writ petition must be dismissed on that ground alone. The learned Advocate General would further submit that the project has been undertaken in different phases right from the year 1995 to 2017 and therefore, the petitioners were aware about this work undertaken by the TNHB and in spite of it, they never chose to come before this Court and question with regard to taking of possession and payment of compensation if it is not done in accordance with law, at the contemporaneous period of time. The learned Advocate General submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has frowned upon and cautioned the Courts about the delays and has held that delay is fatal in questioning the land acquisition proceedings and it should not be entertained by the Courts if it is not questioned within a reasonable time

and the parties choose to approach Courts after a lapse of several decades.

(50) As per the counter affidavit filed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent and also the Status Report filed by the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent, it is seen that the proposal to carry on with the housing scheme came up for discussion before the Assembly only in the month of March 2020. It is thereafter that the Housing Board started calling for tender in order to undertake the scheme work and the tender is said to have been opened on 26.06.2020. Right from the year 1998, when the Section 4[1] Notification was issued, upto the year 2020, the revenue records stood in the name of the original owners. In fact, even some Sale Deeds have been entertained and transactions have taken place and for the first time, the name of the TNHB finds its place in the Patta only after the proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> respondent dated 15.06.2020. This is much after the discussion that took place in the Assembly for undertaking the project, during the month of March 2020. Therefore, for a very long time, there was absolutely no indication from any quarters about the TNHB taking possession of the subject property or paying compensation to the petitioners and the petitioners continued to enjoy the subject property. Since the original records have gone missing, this Court is not able to get any particulars from the State with regard to the taking of possession or payment of compensation and this Court does not have the advantage of looking into the records due to the fact that it is not available. It is not known as to whether the records are intentionally concealed in order to prevent this Court from taking cognizance of some very material facts. This Court is forced to make such an observation since it is nothing but recklessness on the part of the officials to come and state before a High Court that the records are missing, more particularly, when it is claimed that the project is being undertaken in a phased manner from the year 1995 onwards.

(51) Section 24[2] of the Act was brought into force in order to meet those cases where the authorities have failed, due to their inaction, to take possession and to pay compensation for five years or more before the 2013 Act came into force. The Constitution Bench, in more than one place categorically states that Section 24[2] of the Act is a penal provision to punish the Acquiring Authority for its lethargy in not taking physical possession nor paying the compensation after making the award five years or more before the commencement of the 2013 Act. This observation made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court has a lot of significance in the facts of the present case. In the present case, the respondents have not only shown recklessness when it came to not taking possession in the manner known to law and not paying/tendering compensation in the manner known to law, but also it continues till date when they come and tell this Court that the entire original records has gone missing.

- Such an attitude on the part of the respondents really requires penal consequences as provided under Section 24[2] of the Act.
- (52) Section 24[2] of the Act provides for a deemed lapse of the entire acquisition proceedings where the conditions stipulated therein are fulfilled. Such a deemed lapse happens by operation of law. In other words, it does not require a specific declaration by the Court to declare that the acquisition proceedings has become bad unless the situation warrants. The Statute has created such a provision contemplating deemed lapse on the coming into force of the 2013 Act where the conditions stipulated under Section 24[2] of the Act are fulfilled, viz., not taking possession and non payment of compensation. In the present case, this Court has already held that the possession has not been taken and compensation has not been paid in the manner known to law. At the risk of repetition, this Court again reiterates that this court is not trying to pin point some mistakes committed by the authorities while taking possession or paying / tendering compensation. This Court is holding that the possession which has to be taken in a particular mode and the payment of compensation which has be tendered/deposited in a particular mode, has not been done in the facts of the present case and therefore, there is no taking of possession and payment/tendering of compensation in the eye of law. Therefore, the deeming provision under Section 24[2] of the Act automatically comes into play in favour of petitioners by operation of law.
- (53) The cause of action arose for the petitioners to approach this Court only when the officials of the Housing Board started entering into the property and doing some work and when the name in the revenue records was changed in favour of the TNHB and a Tender Notification was issued. Such action taken on the part of the respondents, made the petitioners come before this Court and question the action of the respondents on the ground that they are not entitled to do so by virtue of the acquisition itself getting lapsed by operation of law under Section 24[2] of the Act. Therefore, this Court in answer to the third and fourth issues, hereby holds that the petitioners are not reopening any concluded proceedings and the petitioners are not reviving any stale claims and they knocked the doors of this Court at the right time when the respondents started performing certain actions from the month of June 2020.
- (54) In view of the above discussion, this Court holds that the petitioners satisfy the twin requirements of Section 24[2] of the Act, viz., that the physical possession of the lands was not taken and the compensation has not been paid/tendered/deposited in accordance with law. This Court further holds that the petitioners are not reopening any concluded proceedings and they are not reviving any stale claims and they have approached the Court at the right time. These findings are rendered in line with the judgment of the

Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court referred supra. The petitioners are entitled for the relief claimed by them in this writ petition and the acquisition proceedings insofar as the petitioners are concerned stands lapsed by operation of law under Section 24[2] of the Act.

(55) Before parting with this case, this Court wants to express its deep anguish at the sorry state of affairs that is prevailing in some of the State Undertakings. Even if the State Government wants to implement projects taking into consideration the public interest, there are black sheeps, both at the level of the Government as well as the State Undertakings who will put spokes into those developments for their self aggrandizement. This is a classic case which falls under this category.

(56) There shall be a direction to the State Government to immediately initiate an enquiry into the missing records and take all attempts to trace the original records and also initiate departmental action against persons who were instrumental in ensuring that the original records went missing. This Court is confident that the original records are not actually missing, but safely available with someone and probably after this order, attempts may also be made to destroy the original records. If the State finds that private parties are also involved in this illegal act, criminal complaint shall be initiated and they should be brought to books. If such stringent actions are not taken, the black sheeps will go scot free and this type of illegal activities will continue and ultimately, it will have a direct impact on the public interest. This Court, therefore, expects the State to act with alacrity immediately after the receipt of this order.

(57) In the result, WP.No.10912 of 2020 stands ALLOWED and WP.Nos.10920 and 11535 of 2020 stand DISMISSED. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to Government  
State of Tamil Nadu  
Housing and Urban Development Department  
Secretariat, Fort St George  
Chennai 600 009.

2. The Special Tahsildar [LA]  
Housing Schemes No.3  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
3. The Executive Engineer & Administrative Officer  
Coimbatore Housing Unit, Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
TATABAD, Sivanandha Colony  
Coimbatore 641 012.
4. The Superintending Engineer  
Tamil Nadu Housing Board  
Salem Region, Coimbatore 641 002.
5. The Tahsildar,  
Coimbatore North Taluk  
Coimbatore.

WP.Nos.10912, 10920 & 11535 of 2020

RSV(CO)

RV(01/10/2020)