

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No. 2088 of 2018 (O&M)

Reserved on : 29.03.2022

Date of Decision: 31 August, 2022

Om 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:-** Ms. M.L Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Ankur Mittal, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana with  
Mr. Saurabh Mago, Assistant Advocate General Haryana and  
Ms. Kushaldeep Kaur Manchanda, Advocate for the  
respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

**RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE**

The petitioners have filed the instant writ petition seeking issuance of writ in the nature of Certiorari for quashing the notification dated 17.09.2004 and 27.10.2004 issued under Section 4 and Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and award dated 09.03.2006 in view of Section 24(2) of Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 and have also impugned the order dated 19.12.2016 vide which the claim of the petitioners under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013 has been rejected by the respondents.

2. The controversy which cropped up around interpretation of Section 24(2) of Act of 2013 was put at rest by a Constitution Bench of the

Supreme Court of India in case **Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal and others AIR 2020 SC 1496** wherein principles for declaring the acquisition as deemed to have lapsed under Section 24(2) of Act of 2013 were laid down. The Apex Court has discussed in detail all the aspects necessary and relevant for interpreting Section 24(2) of Act of 2013, and in this regard, the reference is being made to the concluding paragraphs of the judgment, which 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shall continue as provided under Section 24(1)(b) of the Act of 2013 under the Act of 1894 as if it has not been repealed.***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 interpretation of Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013 by the Supreme Court is that to seek lapsing, both the contingencies provided, i.e. about the physical possession and the payment of compensation, are to be fulfilled, meaning thereby if either of the conditions are not satisfied, there would be no lapsing. As far as the

obligation to make the payment in lieu of the land acquired is concerned, it has been clarified that such obligation to pay is complete by tendering the compensation, which would mean that the compensation amount was made available to the land owner and if he has not accepted the same, it will not be available for the land owner to claim that the compensation has not been paid. Similarly, word “deposit” has been interpreted to mean depositing with the LAC or the Treasury or the Reference Court. Drawing of panchnama has been considered to be a valid proof of taking physical possession and once the land stands vested in the State, there is no divesting provided under Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013. The Supreme Court of India has further clarified that the period for which any interim order was in operation, will be excluded while computing the gap period of five years. Similarly, it has been clarified that Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013 does not give rise to new cause of action to question legality of concluded proceedings of land acquisition as it applies to only those cases wherein the proceedings were pending on the date of enforcement of Act of 2013.

4. As per the case put forth by the petitioners, they are owners in possession of the land bearing Khasra No. 188 (2-16), 2451/190 (1-8), 2454/211 (3-11) i.e. 1 Bigha 0.8 Biswa and Khasra no. 217 (1-9) and 2462/219 (0-18) to the extent of their share i.e. 2/15<sup>th</sup> share situated within the revenue estate of Village Shikohpur, Tehsil and District Gurugram. The said land was acquired by the State of Haryana through Industries Department vide notifications dated 17.09.2004 and 27.10.2004 issued under Section 4 and Section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, respectively, followed by Award dated 09.03.2006 for the public purpose namely for setting up of Chaudhary Devi Lal, Industrial Model Township, Phase-V,

Manesar, to be planned and developed as an integrated complex for Industrial, Institutional, Commercial, Recreational and other public utilities on land measuring 956 Acres 5 Kanal 18 Marla of villages Nabada Fatehpur, Naurangpur, Manesar, Lakhnoula, Naharpur Kasan and Shikohpur, Tehsil and District Gurugram. The petitioners have contended that till date they are in physical possession of the land in question and neither the petitioners have received the amount of compensation nor it has been deposited in accordance with law before the Reference Court. Thus, they have prayed for declaring the acquisition proceedings to have been lapsed under Section 24(2) of Act of 2013.

5. They had earlier approached this Court by filing a Civil Writ Petition No. 17485 of 2014 seeking similar relief from this Court and same was disposed of vide order dated 07.05.2015 with directions to the respondents to decide the representation of the petitioners by passing a speaking order. Thereafter, in compliance of the said order the representation given by the petitioners was considered and decided vide order dated 19.12.2016 and the claim of the petitioners was rejected by observing that possession of the land in question was taken by recording Rapat Roznamcha No. 548 dated 20.03.2006 and Mutation No. 3449 dated 27.06.2013 had also been sanctioned. As regards compensation, it was observed that the majority of compensation had been disbursed and the petitioners had intentionally not lifted the amount. Thus, in view of the aforesaid facts, the claim of the petitioners was rejected.

6. The petitioners have challenged the aforesaid order on the ground that finding as regards the possession of the land is wrong and further, since compensation has not been received by the petitioners, the

acquisition proceedings qua the land in question stand lapsed under Section 24(2) of Act of 2013.

7. Pursuant to issuance of notice of motion, the respondents filed a detailed written statement and thereafter an affidavit in light of the judgment passed by the Supreme Court in Indore Development Authority (supra) to controvert the pleas raised by the petitioners. Mr. Ankur Mittal, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana has pleaded that out of the total land claimed in the petition, the land comprised in Khasra no. 217 (1-9) and 2462/219 (0-18) of Village Shikohpur was not forming part of the notification dated 17.09.2004 issued under Section 4 of Act of 1894, thus the relief being sought as regards these parcels of land is completely baseless. As regards the rest of the parcels, he submits that the possession of the land was taken by recording Rapat No. 548 dated 20.03.2006 and Mutation no. 3449 dated 27.06.2013 was sanctioned in favour of HSIIDC. As regards the compensation, he has submitted that the entire amount of compensation was tendered at the time of announcement of award and more than 80% of the total compensation has been disbursed. The undisbursed amount was deposited in the Court vide cheque dated 26.08.2015. This shows that the amount of compensation was duly tendered and the obligation of the State to pay the compensation stands discharged. In view thereof, none of the contingencies provided in Section 24(2) of Act of 2013 are fulfilled and no declaration as to lapsing of acquisition proceedings can be made. Since speaking order dated 19.12.2016 was passed after observing the aforesaid facts, he has contended that the same does not suffer from any illegality.

8. He further submits that the petitioners had earlier challenged the acquisition proceedings by filing Civil Writ Petition No. 24380 of 2013 seeking release of the land in question comprised in Khasra no 188 (2-16), 2451/190 (1-8), 2454/211 (3-11), 217 (1-9) and 2462/219 (0-18) in village Shikohpur, Tehsil and District Gurugram. The said writ petition was disposed of vide order dated 08.11.2013 with direction to authorities to consider and decide their claim in light of the observations made in order dated 15.07.2013 passed in CWP no. 20932 of 2012. Suffice to mention, the petitioners had challenged the acquisition proceedings on merits and had sought release of their land on the ground that the landowners were induced to sell the land, leading it to be released in favour of the private builders and the roads re-aligned to extend benefit to them. After considering all the contentions, the claim was rejected vide a detailed speaking order dated 09.04.2014 after granting opportunity of hearing to the petitioners. This order was never challenged by the petitioners, meaning thereby that the acquisition proceedings qua the land in question stand upheld and the instant petition is not at all maintainable in view of the law laid down in Indore Development Authority (supra).

9. Apart from making the aforementioned submissions, Mr. Mittal has further contended that the land in question was acquired for the public purpose, namely, setting up of Chaudhary Devi Lal, Industrial Model Township, Phase-V, Manesar and as per the approved layout plan, the land in question is very much essential to complete the development work as per the planning. So much so it affects the planning of 75 meter wide road and site reserved for school as well as community centre.

10. Having heard the respective arguments, going through the respective pleadings and above all the exposition in Indore Development Authority (supra), we are of the considered opinion that the instant writ petition is liable to be dismissed for more than one reason:-

- a) The petitioners have invoked the provisions of Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013 to claim lapsing of the land acquisition proceedings qua the land in question. The Supreme Court of India in Indore Development Authority (supra) has categorically held that the plea of Section 24 (2) is available to only those land owners, in respect of whom the acquisition proceedings were pending on the date of coming into effect the Act of 2013 i.e. 01.01.2014. It has been clarified that Section 24 contemplates pending proceedings and not the concluded one. After making the detailed discussions and placing reliance on the previous judicial pronouncements, the Supreme Court of India in para No. 359 has made it clear that Section 24(2) cannot be used to revive dead and stale claims and concluded cases as the same cannot be permitted to be canvassed on the pretext of enactment of Section 24. Para 359 and is extracted herein below:-

*‘...359. We are of the considered opinion that Section 24 cannot be used to revive dead and stale claims and concluded cases. They cannot be inquired into within the purview of Section 24 of the Act of 2013. The provisions of Section 24 do not invalidate the judgments and orders of the Court, where rights and claims have been lost and negated. There is no revival of the barred claims by operation of law. Thus, stale and dead claims cannot be permitted to be canvassed on the pretext of enactment of Section 24. In exceptional cases, when in fact, the payment has not been made, but possession has been taken, the remedy lies elsewhere if the case is not covered by the proviso. It is the Court to consider it independently not under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013...’*

The earlier petition filed by the petitioners challenging the acquisition proceedings bearing Civil Writ Petition No. 24380 of 2013 was disposed of with directions to the respondents to decide their claim and the same was rejected by passing a speaking order dated 09.04.2014 which attained finality. The acquisition proceedings stand duly validated and thus, in view of above, the plea of lapsing of the acquisition under Section 24 (2) of the Act of 2013 is not available to the petitioners.

- a) Though the petitioners have contended that they are in actual physical possession of the land in question, however, the said averment is not tenable in view of the interpretation of '*physical possession*' made by the Apex Court in Indore Development Authority (Supra) wherein the Hon'ble Court has categorically held that the word possession used in the Act of 1894 has same meaning as that of physical possession used in Section 24 (2) of Act of 2013. When the State Government acquires the land and draws memorandum of taking possession which in the present case is by recording Rapat Roznamcha no. 548 dated 20.03.2006 that amounts to taking of the physical possession of the land and once the possession is taken, there is absolute vesting of the land in the State. Thereafter even if the landowner retains the possession of the land, he is a trespasser, and such possession of trespasser enures for the benefit and on behalf of the owner i.e. State. Since possession has been taken by recording Rapat Roznamcha no. 548 dated 20.03.2006, therefore, physical possession on the land is of the State. The

plea of the petitioners that they are in physical possession of the land is, thus, hereby rejected. If at all possession has been retained by them, it is only as trespassers and not as owners. As a consequence thereof one of the essentials for claiming lapsing of acquisition proceedings goes.

- b) As regards the status of compensation the respondents have categorically pleaded in the reply that the amount of compensation for the entire acquired land was made available to all the landowners which is substantiated from the fact that the majority of compensation amount stands disbursed to the landowners. In this regard, Mr. Mittal has asserted that in view of the exposition in Indore Development Authority (supra) the obligation of the State to pay the compensation is discharged if the amount of compensation is tendered which has been interpreted to mean that the amount was made available to the land owners as observed in Para 203 which is reproduced here in below:-

*‘...203. The word “paid” in Section 31(1) to the landowner cannot include in its ambit the expression “deposited” in Court. Deposit cannot be said to be payment made to landowners. Deposit is on being prevented from payment. **However, in case there is a tender of the amount that is to mean amount is made available to the landowner that would be a discharge of the obligation to make the payment and in that event such a person cannot be penalised for the default in making the payment.** In default to deposit in Court, the liability is to make the payment of interest under Section 34 of Act of 1894. Sections 32 and 33 (which had been relied upon by the landowners’ counsel to say that valuable rights inhere, in the event of deposit with Court, thus making deposit under Section 31 mandatory) provide for investing amounts in the Government securities, or seeking alternative lands, in lieu of*

*compensation, etc. Such deposits, cannot fetch higher interest than the 15 per cent contemplated under Section 34, which is pari materia to Section 80 of Act of 2013. Section 34 is pari materia to Section 80 of Act of 2013 in which also the similar rate of interest has been specified. Even if the amount is not deposited in Reference Court nor with the treasury as against the name of the person interested who is entitled to receive it, if Collector has been prevented to make the payment due to exigencies provided in Section 31(2), interest to be paid. **However, in case the deposit is made without tendering it to the person interested, the liability to pay the interest under Section 34, shall continue.** Even assuming deposit in the Reference Court is taken to be mandatory, in that case too interest has to follow as specified in Section 34. However, acquisition proceeding cannot lapse due to non-deposit....”*

The afore-stated facts clearly reveal that the amount of compensation was duly tendered so much so the majority of the compensation amount stands disbursed and thus, the State has discharged its obligation towards making the compensation for the land acquired and thus the plea being raised by the petitioner that they have not been paid the compensation amount is rejected.

c) Since none of the contingencies provided in Section 24 (2) of Act of 2013 are fulfilled as the possession of the land stands duly taken by recording rapat no. 548 dated 20.03.2006 pursuant to which the mutation also stands sanctioned and further the amount of compensation has lapsed under Section 24(2) of Act of 2013.

d) Also, there is no point to interfere in the acquisition proceedings when the land in question is essential for development of infrastructure as it is affecting the development

of road and thus, cannot be released from the acquisition proceedings at any cost.

11. As a sequel of the above discussion and in view of the law summarized in para 363 of Indore Development Authority (supra), specifically after having recorded that in the case at hand, the physical possession of the land in question having been taken, the obligation for payment of compensation stands discharged and also considering that the land in question is very much essential to achieve the public purpose, 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 instant petition is dismissed.

12. Having dismissed the main writ petition, all pending applications, if any, also meet the same fate. The speaking order is accordingly affirmed. Status quo, if any, stands vacated.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)  
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)  
JUDGE

31 August, 2022  
ravinder

|                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | √Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | √Yes/No |