



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : 20.04.2023

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.SATHISH KUMAR

A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023
and C.M.P.(MD)No.5278 of 2023

The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Aruppukottai (Land Acquisition),
Virudhunagar.

... Appellant

Vs.

Dhanalakshmi (Died)
2.Gopalramanujam

... Respondents

(R2 is brought on record as LRs of the deceased
sole respondent vide Court order dated 20.04.2023
made in C.M.P.(MD)Nos.7024 to 7026 of 2021)

PRAYER: This Appeal Suit is filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, against the judgment and decree dated 20.10.2016 made in L.A.O.P.No.06 of 2011 on the file of the Land Acquisition Tribunal, Subordinate Court, Aruppukottai.

For Appellant : Mr.D.Sasikumar,
Addl. Govt. Pleader



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

JUDGMENT

WEB COPY

Challenging the award passed by the Land Acquisition Tribunal, Subordinate Court, Aruppukottai in L.A.O.P.No.06/2011, dated 20.10.2016, the appellant has filed this Appeal Suit.

2. A total extent of 36.67 hectares of land was acquired for the purpose of formation of an irrigation tank at Arupukottai Taluk, Periyapuliyampatti Village.

3. The Notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was issued on 14.10.2004. The Land Acquisition Officer has passed an award on 08.10.2007, fixing the value at the rate of Rs.209/- per cent and Rs.51,690/- per hectare. Not satisfied with the award amount determined by the Land Acquisition Officer, a reference was made to the Land Acquisition Tribunal. The claimant claimed enhanced compensation mainly on the ground that the acquired land is situated near Arupukotti – Virudhunagar State Highways. Besides that, the area was already included within the Municipal limit 30 years back and there are several developments took place including factories and house sites etc. Besides that, within 1 k.m., a Medical College Hospital and a new bus stand have come up. Hence, the claimant claimed enhanced compensation.



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

4. Before the Land Acquisition Tribunal, on the side of the claimant, P.Ws.1 and 2 were examined and Exs.P1 to P5 were marked. On the side of the respondent, R.W.1 was examined and Exs.R1 to R4 were marked.

5. The Land Acquisition Tribunal (Subordinate Court), Aruppukottai, after considering the documentary evidence adduced on the side of the claimant, enhanced the compensation from Rs.209/- to Rs.5,000/- per cent and deducted 30% for developmental charges and ultimately fixed the compensation at the rate of Rs.3,500/- per cent. Challenging the same, the present appeal has been filed by the appellant.

6. The learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the appellant would submit that the acquired land is situated within the vicinity of the area, which has already been acquired in the year 2004, for the purpose of construction of fertiliser godown and model land value has been taken by the Land Acquisition Officer to fix the value. However, the Tribunal has given undue importance to the sale deeds and fixed the compensation in excess. Hence, he prayed for allowing of this appeal.



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

7. Since already this Court dismissed the appeal suit filed by the similarly placed persons, this Court is of the view that notice to the respondents is not required.

8. In the light of the submissions made by the learned Additional Government Pleader appearing for the appellant, now the points for consideration in these appeals are (i) whether the Tribunal has exceeded its jurisdiction in fixing the enhanced compensation? and (ii) whether the Tribunal has fixed the enhanced compensation without any evidence on record?

9. It is not in dispute that an extent of 36.67 hectares of land was acquired for the purpose of construction of an irrigation tank. The evidence adduced before the reference Court clearly established that the acquired land is situated very near to Virudhunagar - Arupukottai State Highways. Further, the evidence adduced on the side of the claimant, which was admitted by R.W.1, clearly indicates that there are several developments taken place in the nearby places, including factories and other commercial entities also come up. It is also established before the Tribunal that the acquired land included within the jurisdiction of the Municipality 30 years back. That apart, the Tribunal took note of Exs.P1 to P5/sale deeds. On a perusal



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

of the sale deeds, the Tribunal found that even several transactions took place right from 2003 and 2004, prior to 4(1) Notification. The evidence of P.W.2/Document Writer, who prepared the documents has also spoken about the value of the property. According to him, the documents have been registered on the guideline value fixed by the Government. Therefore, the documents registered earlier even prior to the acquisition show that the guideline value of the property is much more. The Land Acquisition Tribunal considering the above documents, enhanced the compensation at the rate of Rs.5,000/- per cent and deducted 30% for developmental charges and ultimately fixed the compensation at the rate of Rs. 3,500/- .

10. A perusal of the entire evidence particularly the admission made by R.W.1 reveals that there are various developmental activities took place nearby places. The Land Acquisition Officer has fixed the compensation without even collecting any documents for three years which is not in accordance with law. Further, the model land which relied upon by the Acquisition Officer is also situate at a distance of 4 k.ms. from the acquired land, which is also established on record.



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

11. In such a view of the mater, the Tribunal fixing the compensation based on the documentary evidence and also developments took place even prior to Section 4(1) Notification which cannot be said to be abnormal and excessive. Hence, this Court does not find any merit in this appeal.

12. In the result, this Appeal Suit is dismissed and the award passed by the Land Acquisition Tribunal (Subordinate Court), Aruppukottai in L.A.O.P.No.06 of 2011, dated 20.10.2016 is confirmed. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

20.04.2023

NCC : Yes

Index : Yes/No

vsm



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The The Land Acquisition Tribunal
(Subordinate Court),
Aruppukottai.
 - 2.The Section Officer,
Vernacular Records,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

N.SATHISH KUMAR, J.

vsm

A.S.(MD)No.84 of 2023

20.04.2023