

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

FIRST APPEAL NO.1585 OF 2004 WITH CA/5695/2006 IN FA/1585/2004

The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
U.T.P.H., Jalgaon.

.. Appellant
(Original Respondent)

Versus

Dattatraya Ramdas Patil, Age 26 years,
Occu. Farmer, R/o. Shivare, Tal. Parola,
District Jalgaon.

.. Respondent
(Original Claimant)

...

AND FA/1588/2004 WITH CA/5690/2006 IN FA/1588/2004

The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
U.T.P.H., Jalgaon.

.. Appellant
(Original Respondent)

Versus

Shri Sitaram Pandit Patil, Age 48 years,
Occu. Farmer, R/o. Shivare, Tal. Parola,
District Jalgaon.

.. Respondent
(Original Claimant)

...

AND FA/1586/2004 WITH CA/5688/2006 IN FA/1586/2004

The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
U.T.P.H., Jalgaon.

.. Appellant
(Original Respondent)

Versus

Shri Bhikan Ramdas Patil, Age 48 years,
Occu. Farmer, R/o. Shivare, Tal. Parola,
District Jalgaon.

.. Respondent
(Original Claimant)

...

AND FA/1587/2004 WITH CA/5689/2006 IN FA/1587/2004

The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
U.T.P.H., Jalgaon.

.. Appellant
(Original Respondent)

Versus

Ashok Harchand Patil, Age 41 years,
Occu. Farmer, R/o. Shivare, Tal. Parola,
District Jalgaon.

.. Respondent
(Original Claimant)

...
Mr. B. V. Virdhe, AGP for Appellant in all the matters.
Mr. R. C. Patil, Advocate for Respondents-claimants

...
CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR, J.

DATE : 5th MAY, 2021

ORAL ORDER :-

The present Appeal is arising out of the Judgment and Award dated 02-05-2002 passed in Land Acquisition Reference No. 1 to 4 of 1994 by the learned Reference Court, enhancing the amount of compensation for the acquired lands.

2. The lands-in-question are acquired for the purpose of Shivara Percolation Tank at village Shivare, Taluka Parola, District Jalgaon. The notification under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, was issued on 14-03-1989. Thereafter, the Award was passed on 30-03-1993. Feeling dis-satisfied with the amount of compensation granted by the Special Land Acquisition Officer, a Reference was preferred under Section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, in which, the amount has been enhanced to the tune of Rs.400/- per R from Rs.120/- per R. The said Judgment and Award is under challenge in this Appeal.

3. I have heard the learned AGP appearing for the appellant-State of Maharashtra and Mr. R. C. Patil, learned counsel appearing for the respondents-claimants.

4. The only ground challenging the impugned Judgment and Award is that, the amount granted by the learned Reference Court is exorbitant. It is pointed out that the interest under Section 28 of the L.A. Act ought to have granted from the date of Award but has been granted from the date of notification under Section 4 of the L. A. Act, contrary to Judgment of the Full Bench of this Court in a case of ***State of Maharashtra Versus Kailash Shiva Rangari***¹.

¹ 2016(4) ALL MR 513 (FB.)

5. To consider the rival contentions of the parties, I have gone through the record and proceedings and also the impugned Judgment and Award.

6. After going through the Judgment and Award, it is revealed that the learned Reference Court has scrutinized the oral as well as documentary evidence available on record in detail, while determining the market value. The learned Reference Court has also considered the relevant factors which are to be taken into consideration as per the well settled principles of law, while arriving at a just and fair compensation.

7. The learned Reference Court has considered the Judgment in the case of (1) *Chimanlal Versus Land Acquisition Officer, Poona and others*², (2) *Mahavir Prasad and others Versus Collector Cuttak and others*³, and other Judgments noted in the impugned Judgment and on the basis of principles of law laid down in those Judgments, considered the case in hand. In paragraphs No. 19 and 20 of the impugned Judgment, the learned Reference Court has considered potentiality of the land in the sale instances produced on record at Exhibit-22 and fixed the amount of market value as Rs.400/- per R for Jirayat land, which is just and fair according to me.

8. Nothing has been brought on record by the appellant in this matter to show contrary or to show perversity in the findings recorded by the learned Reference Court. In that view of the matter, I do not find any merit in the present matter.

9. Moreover, in view of the Government policy not to file or to contest appeal in the matter wherein the amount awarded by the learned Reference Court is not more than four times than the amount awarded by SLAO, as per Government Resolution dated 03-11-2016 and subsequent corrigendum dated 23-02-2017 issued in that regard, I am of the view that on

² AIR 1988 SC 1652

³ AIR 1987 SC 720

this count also the appeal needs to be dismissed.

10. However, in view of the Judgment of Full Bench in ***State of Maharashtra Versus Kailash Shiva Rangari*** (*supra*), operative part of the impugned Judgment and Award needs to be modified and the interest awarded by learned Reference Court 'from the date of taking possession of the land' needs to be granted 'from the date of Award'.

11. Accordingly, the present Appeal is partly allowed as under :

ORDER

- (I) The First Appeals are partly allowed.
- (II) The clause in regard to awarding of interest, in the operative part of the impugned Judgment and Award, passed by the Reference Court is modified, and, it is held that the claimants are entitled for the interest under Section 28 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, from the date of Award. For the first year, the interest would be @ 9% per annum and for the subsequent period, it would be @ 15% per annum till realization of the entire amount of the Award.
- (III) No order as to costs.
- (IV) Pending Civil Applications stand disposed of.

(ANIL S. KILOR)
JUDGE