

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.09.2020

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.ANAND VENKATESH

W.P.No. 12636 of 2019
and
WMP No.12870 of 2019

B.Hanifa

...Petitioner

Vs.

1 The State of Tamil Nadu
rep. by
the Secretary to Government
Social Welfare Department
Fort St.George, Chennai.

2 The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.

3 The Special Tahsildar
Adi-Dravidar Welfare Community
Chengalpattu.

...Respondents

This Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue a Writ of Declaration declaring that entire land acquisition proceedings initiated by way of notification under section 4(1) dated 28.09.1983 and also declare the award dated 30.03.1985 passed in Award No.2/1984-85 in respect of Petitioner's land measuring extend of 27 1/4 cents in Vayalur Village is lapsed by virtue of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act 2013.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Jagadish

For Respondents 1 to 3:Mr.D.Raja,
Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

This Writ Petition has been filed seeking for the issue of a writ of declaration to declare that the acquisition proceedings has lapsed by virtue of Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition

Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (herein after called as 'Act').

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the property in question was a subject matter of acquisition, by virtue of a notification issued under Section 4(1) of 1894 Act on 28.09.1983. The learned counsel further submitted that the award was also passed. According to the petitioner, neither the award amount was paid nor the possession was taken and therefore, the acquisition itself lapsed by virtue of the Act.

3. Mr.D.Raja, learned Additional Government Pleader appearing on behalf of the respondents submitted that the Writ Petition filed by the petitioner is not maintainable, since, admittedly, the petitioner is a subsequent purchaser of the property, by virtue of the sale deed dated 19.01.1995. The learned counsel submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in judgment in 'Shivkumar and Others V. Union Of India and Others' reported in 2019 [10] SCC 229 has categorically held that any sale deed that is executed after the issuance of 4(1) notification is null and void and non-est in the eye of law and a subsequent purchaser can never get any benefits under Section 24(2) of the Act.

4. This Court has carefully considered the submissions made on either side and the materials available on record.

5. This Court finds force in the submissions made by the learned Additional Government Pleader. The petitioner in the present case is admittedly a subsequent purchaser by virtue of the registered sale deed dated 19.01.1995. This sale deed was executed much after the award proceedings and the petitioner is claiming for the benefit under Section 24(2) of the Act. Insofar as the right of subsequent purchasers are concerned, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Shivkumar and Others V. Union Of India and Others' referred supra, has categorically held that "A purchaser of a property, after the issuance of the Notification under Section 4[1] of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, does not have any right to challenge the original acquisition or to claim any benefits after the coming into force of the 2013 Act". The Hon'ble Supreme Court has also held that "a transaction of sale that is effected after 4[1] Notification is void and the said sale transaction will not clothe the subsequent purchaser with any right whatsoever. Once a 4[1] Notification is issued, the property becomes incapable of being sold or transacted and the sale transaction is void ab initio and is a nullity and it does not confer any right or title over the subsequent purchaser of the property."

6. In view of the categorical pronouncement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the petitioner is not entitled to maintain this Writ Petition, since the right and title of the petitioner has been held to be non-est in the eye of law and therefore, the petitioner is not entitled to the relief as claimed in the present Writ Petition.

7. In the result, this Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

mra
To

- 1 The Secretary to Government
State of Tamil Nadu
Social Welfare Department
Fort St.George, Chennai.
- 2 The District Collector
Kancheepuram District
Kancheepuram.
- 3 The Special Tahsildar
Adi-Dravidar Welfare Community
Chengalpattu.

+1 cc to M/s.C.Jagadish, Advocate Sr.No. 30040
+1 cc to The Government Pleader, Sr.No. 30096

सत्यमेव जयते

W.P.No. 12636 of 2019
and WMP No.12870 of 2019

MG(CO)
RMP(13/10/2020)

WEB COPY