

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No.20754 of 2016
Date of decision: 03.02.2022

Pahal Singh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE.**

Present:- Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana, with
Mr. Saurabh Mago, Assistant Advocate General Haryana.

Mr. Amar Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate, and
Mr. Shiva Parashar, Advocate, for the respondent-HUDA.

(The aforesaid presence is being recorded through video conferencing since the proceedings
are being conducted in virtual Court).

...

RAVI SHANKER JHA, C.J. (ORAL)

1. The controversy involved in the matter at hand revolves around the applicability of Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 onto the facts of the case wherein the award under section 11 of the Land Acquisition Act 1894 was announced on 07.10.1991 i.e. more than five years prior to the commencement of the Act of 2013 on 01.01.2014 and as contended by the petitioners, the possession of the land in question is not taken by the State. The compensation has been received by the petitioners and thus, only ground based on which the lapsing of acquisition proceedings has been claimed is inaction on the part of the State to take physical possession of the land in question.

2. The controversy cropped up around interpretation of Section 24(2) of Act of 2013 was put at rest by the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal and others AIR 2020 SC 1496*** thereby laying down principles for declaring the acquisition deemed to have been lapsed under section 24(2) of Act of 2013. The Apex Court has discussed in detail all the aspects necessary and relevant for interpreting section 24(2) of Act of 2013, however, for the purpose of deciding the matter at hand, the reference to the concluding paragraphs of the judgment would be suffice and are reproduced herein below:-

‘....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.'

3. The sum and substance of the judgment can be summarized in the following manner for more clarity on the principles laid down by the Constitution Bench:-

- (a) In all those cases wherein the acquisition process had been initiated but the award has not been announced under section 11 of the Act of 1894, on the date of commencement of the Act of 2013 i.e. 01.01.2014, there is no lapse of proceedings and the same will

continue, however, with the rider that the compensation has to be determined under the provisions of Act of 2013. All those cases wherein the award under section 11 of the Act of 1894 has been announced prior to commencement of the Act of 2013, the provisions of the Act of 2013 would have no bearing or application and the proceedings will continue in respect of those cases, as if, the Act of 1894 has not been repealed.

- (b) The word 'or' used in between the both the contingencies of section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 is to be read as '***nor***' or as '***and***' which means that to seek lapsing of the acquisition proceedings both the contingencies must be fulfilled. Meaning thereby, that if the possession had been taken but the compensation was not received, there would be no lapse. Similarly, if compensation has been accepted but the possession has not been taken, there would be no lapsing. (***reference to para 99 and 363(2) of the judgment***)
- (c) As far as the aspect of compensation for the land acquired is concerned, the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has categorically observed that 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. What is required to be proved is that the compensation amount was tendered which has been explained in ***para 203*** that the tendering of the amount would mean that the amount is made available to the landowner and that would be a discharge of the obligation to make the payment and in that event such a person cannot be penalized for the default in making the payment. While

referring to section 31(1), 31(2), 34 of the Act of 1894 and comparing them with the para materia provisions i.e. section 71 and 80 of the Act of 2013, the Hon'ble Apex Court has clarified that the only consequence of non-payment of compensation is to make the payment of interest as per section 34 of the Act of 1894. Even the Hon'ble Supreme Court has further clarified that once the payment of compensation has been offered/tendered under section 31(1), the acquiring authority cannot be penalized for non-payment as the amount has remain unpaid due to refusal to accept by the landowner. To clarify it further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has further observed that if a landowner has filed the reference for higher compensation he cannot claim that he was not paid the amount.

- (d) While reading the proviso to section be part of section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has clarified that in case, the offer for payment has been made but not deposited, liability to pay amount along with interest subsist and if not deposited for 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. Regarding the deposit, it has been clarified in ***para 242*** of the judgment that for the higher compensation to follow, the money should not have been deposited with the Land Acquisition Collector or in the treasury or in the Court with respect to majority of land holdings, meaning thereby if it was deposited in any of the three

modes with respect to majority of holdings, the higher compensation will not follow, but interest under section 34 of the Act of 1894 would be the consequence.

- (e) As regards the mode of taking possession, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had clarified that drawing of inquest report/ memorandum would mean that physical possession has been taken. The law with regard to vesting of land has once again be reiterated to hold that once the possession has been taken under section 16 of the Act of 1894, the land vest in the State and there cannot be any divesting or lapsing.
- (f) While computing the gap period of five years between the date of award and commencement of the Act of 2013, any interim order subsisting is to be excluded which means that after excluding the interim order, the pre-requisite gap period of 5 years is not there, the provisions of section 24(2) cannot be invoked.
- (g) The Hon'ble Court has further clarified that if the acquisition of land had earlier been challenged and the acquisition was upheld, which means the proceeding stood concluded, the umbrella protection of section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 cannot be invoke as it does not revive stale and time barred claims.
- (h) In para 337, the Hon'ble Court has made it clear that the provision of section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 is meant to be invoked by the beneficiaries i.e. landowners who were recorded so at the time of issuance of notification under section 4 of the Act of 1894. Any

subsequent purchaser, POA holder or otherwise, cannot invoke the provisions of section 24(2) of the Act of 2013.

4. As per the case put forth by the petitioners, they are owner in possession of the land comprised in Khasra no. 42//17, 16/2, 18, 19/1, 22/2, 22/2, 23, 24, 25/1, 49//3/2, 4/2 measuring 2400 sq. yards Mewala Maharajpur, Tehsil and District Faridabad. The said land was acquired by the State of Haryana vide notifications dated 02.08.1989 and 01.08.1990 issued under section 4 and section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, followed by award dated 07.10.1991 for the public purpose namely, Development and Utilization of land for Residential and Commercial Sector 45 Faridabad. It is the case of the petitioners that despite having acquired the land in question, the State has failed to take possession of the land and till date the petitioners are in actual physical possession of the land in question. The land surrounding the land of the petitioners has been released in favour of private builders even after announcement of award whereas despite having submitted various representations, the land of the petitioners has not been released. The planning of the small chunk of land as that of the petitioners is not possible. Further it has been admitted that the Petitioners have already received the amount of compensation. In view of the aforesaid, prayer has been made to declare the acquisition proceedings having been lapsed under section 24(2) of Act of 2013.

5. Per contra, Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the State of Haryana submits that the contention of the petitioners of being in the possession of the land in question is devoid of merit as the possession of the land was taken vide Rapat no. 135 dated 13.11.2014 as earlier due to stay on the dispossession qua the land in question in CWP No. 1994 of

1991, possession could not have been taken with respect to land in question as well. In view of the judgment passed in Indore Development Authority (Supra) in cases wherein, the State was not able to taken possession due to operation of stay has to be excluded while calculating the period of 5 years prior to 01.01.2014. Further, he contends that the compensation for land in question was duly tendered i.e., was made available to the petitioners and by making reference to the reply filed on behalf of the respondent State that the amount of compensation has already been received by the petitioners except for the land comprised in Khasra no. 42//24 (8-0) and 42//25/1 (2-17). Even for the land as regards which compensation has not been taken, the amount was duly tendered and is still available for disbursement, however the petitioners have chosen not to receive the same. By placing reliance on the judgment passed by Apex Court in Indore Development Authority's case (supra) he has argued that the present petition merits dismissal as contingencies mentioned in Section 24(2) of Act of 2013 are not fulfilled since five-year requisite period is not present coupled with the fact that compensation stands received by the petitioners and the possession of land has been taken by the State by drawing Panchnama. As regards the contention of the petitioners that the land of the private builders has been released, he has strong objection that such contention is nothing more than bald assertion as the petitioners have not placed any material on record to substantiate same. Further, he submits that petitioners have accepted the fate of acquisition proceedings by admittedly receiving the compensation amount and not agitating against the acquisition proceedings at the relevant point of time. He maintains the stand that land in question is essential for achieving the public purpose and cannot be released from the acquisition proceedings.

6. After having perused the pleadings of both the contesting parties and recording their contentions, we have no hesitation to conclude that the matter at hand is squarely covered by the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Indore Development Authority (supra) and the prayer of the petitioner claiming lapsing of acquisition proceedings deserves dismissal. As regards the possession of the land in question, the respondents have submitted that due to operation of stay on land in question in CWP no. 1994 of 1991 possession of the land was taken after such stay was vacated, by drawing Rapat Roznamcha no. 135 dated 13.11.2014. The fact of operation of stay has not been denied by the petitioners as well since no replication has been filed on behalf of the petitioners even though reply was filed on 25.03.2021. Thus, in view of the fact that earlier possession could not have been taken due to operation of stay, the State cannot be held responsible for inaction in taking possession. Thus, once stay was vacated due possession of land stands taken, and the land is vested in the State free from all encumbrances.

7. Even if it is taken that possession was not taken prior to 01.01.2014, yet no lapsing of acquisition proceedings can be claimed by the petitioners as for seeking lapsing of acquisition proceedings under section 24(2) of Act of 2013, both of the contingencies shall be fulfilled simultaneously i.e. neither the possession should have been taken nor compensation should have been paid. As far as case at hand is concerned, admittedly the petitioners have received the compensation amount and as stated by learned counsel for State, part compensation which is lying undisbursed was duly tendered to the petitioners, however they have chosen not to receive the same. As regards the

compensation, it is important to highlight here that the Hon'ble Apex court while interpreting the word 'paid' occurring in Sec-24(2) and the word 'deposited' used in proviso to Sec 24 (2) of 2013 Act has very categorically observed the meaning and effect of both by holding that the word 'paid' does not include deposit and in case, the amount has been tendered, the obligation to pay is fulfilled. What would construe to mean "*tender of the amount*" has been explained in para 203 to mean that the amount is/was made available to the landowner and that would be a discharge of the obligation to make the payment. It is the specific stand of the Respondent that the compensation amount was duly tendered to the landowners and same stands substantiated from the fact that compensation has also been received by the petitioners. The aforesaid facts, thus, goes on to show that compensation amount was duly tendered to the petitioners, which they have already received except for part of land. Once it is established that compensation stands tendered and paid, one of the contingencies goes and thus, no lapsing of acquisition proceedings can be claimed by the petitioners. Therefore, in view of aforesaid facts we have no hesitation to hold that both the contingencies mentioned in section 24(2) of Act of 2013 are not fulfilled and thus, instant petition seeking lapsing of acquisition proceedings merits dismissal.

8. As far as the contention of the petitioners with respect to release of land in favour of the private builders is concerned, we are in complete agreement with Mr. Mittal that such plea is nothing more than a bald assertion and a passing reference as the petitioners have failed to discharge their burden for demonstrating any such event. Further, the petitioners have accepted fate of the acquisition proceedings which stood concluded way back in the year 1991 and

thus, under garb of Section 24(2) of Act of 2013, they cannot be allowed to open concluded proceedings that too on the strength of bald averments.

9. Mr. Ankur Mittal on the strength of the facts pleaded in the written statement has vehemently contended that the State acquired the land for the public purpose public purpose for utilization of land for residential and commercial Sector 45 Faridabad as per the plan prepared under the Haryana Urban Development Authority Act, 1977. The public purpose is achieved by drawing/approving the lay out plan. As per the lay out plan prepared for the acquisition in question, the land in question is very much essential to achieve the public purpose and it affects the planning of 1 nos. of primary school, 17 no. of 14 marla category plot, 14 nos. of 1 Kanal plot category, 18 mtr wide road and 9 mn wide internal sector road. We have considered this part of argument raised by the respondents and we are in complete agreement with the same as this is an important factor to be kept in mind while dealing with the case arising out of the acquisition of land to achieve the public purpose and it is the state/its authority who is in the best position to decide about utilization of the land acquired, after it having been vested in State.

10. As a sequel of the above discussion and in view of law summarized in para 363 of Indore Development Authority's case (supra), we have no hesitation to hold that in the instant case, the state has fully discharged its obligation qua both the contingencies occurring in section 24 (2) of 2013 Act and it being so, the present petition merits dismissal and hence, the instant petition is dismissed.

11. Having dismissed the main writ petition, all pending applications, if any also meets the same fate. The writ petition is dismissed. Status quo if any stands vacated.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

03.02.2022
Rajan

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO