

304-12

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**RFA No. 2421 of 2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 21.08.2023**

M/s. Sunglow Overseas Private Limited

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Adarsh Jain, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Shivendra Swaroop, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana

HARKESH MANUJA, J.

CM-5623-CI-2021

Prayer in the present application moved on behalf of the applicant-appellant is for condonation of delay of 2389 days in filing the appeal.

Upon notice, no reply has been filed, however, learned State Counsel vehemently opposes the prayer made therein.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the application, which has been supported by an affidavit of authorized signatory of the appellant.

Concededly, the other similarly situated landowners pertaining to the same acquisition proceedings have already been held entitled for the enhanced amount of compensation pertaining to

the acquired land falling in same revenue estate, i.e. **Village Kheri Kalan, Tehsil & District Faridabad**, to the tune of Rs. 2665/- per square yard, in view of judgment dated 13/14.07.2021 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Civil Appeal No. 2903 of 2021**, titled **"Banwari Lal & Anr. Versus State of Haryana & Ors."**.

Based thereupon, applying the principle of parity, besides awarding just and fair compensation and relying upon the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **"Ningappa Thotappa Angadi (Dead) through LRs Versus Special Land Acquisition Officer and Another", 2020 (19) SCC 599** as well as in view of the contents of application, the same is **allowed** and delay in filing the appeal, as mentioned above, is hereby condoned.

MAIN APPEAL

Present appeal has been preferred under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short "the Act"), to modify the award dated 27.05.2013 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Faridabad (hereinafter to be referred as "Reference Court") and for enhancement of compensation amount.

[2] In pursuance to Haryana Govt. Notification under Section 4 of the Act issued on 14.08.2008, followed by Notification dated 30.08.2008 under Section 6 thereof, the land measuring 94.67 acres, including the land of appellant, situated in revenue estate of Village **Kheri Kalan**, Tehsil & District Faridabad, was acquired. The public purpose for acquisition of the land was stated to be Development & Utilization of Master Plan Roads of Sectors 75 to 89, Faridabad. The Land Acquisition Collector, Urban Estate, Haryana, Faridabad (for

short “LAC”), vide Award No. 16, dated 27.08.2010, assessed the market value of acquired land @ Rs. 42,00,000/- per acre alongwith other statutory benefits.

[3] Dissatisfied with the aforesaid Award, landowners / interested persons filed objections under Section 18 of the Act, which was decided vide award dated 27.05.2013 by learned Reference Court, whereby the market value of the acquired land was enhanced / assessed @ Rs. 1118/- per square yard, besides granting statutory benefits.

[4] It is pertinent to mention here that the matters pertaining to the enhancement were remand by the Apex Court in ***Civil Appeal No(s) 21014-21016 of 2017***, titled ***“Premwati & Ors. Versus State of Haryana & Anr.”***, decided on 06.12.2017, after those were decided by a Coordinate Bench of this Court on 16.09.2015 in ***‘Rampal and others Vs. Land Acquisition Collector and another’, 2016 (1) RCR (Civil) 494***. Thereafter, the matter was again decided by learned Single Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 31.05.2019 in ***Ram Pal’s case (supra)***, whereby the market value for the acquired land with regard to the notification dated 14.08.2008 pertaining to Villages Neemka, Fajjupur Majra Neemka, Kheri Khurd, Faridpur, **Kheri Kalan**, Bhupani, Riwajpur and Tikawali, was fixed @ Rs. 1760/- per square yard (Rs. 85,18,400/- per acre).

[5] Against the judgment dated 31.05.2019 (supra), parties again approached Hon’ble Supreme Court in a batch of appeals, lead case of which was Civil Appeal No. 2903 of 2021, titled ***“Banwari Lal***

& Anr. Versus State of Haryana & Ors.”, which have been decided on three different dates, 08.07.2021, 13.07.2021 & 14.07.2021.

[6] It is contended by learned counsel for the appellant(s) that present appeal is squarely covered with the judgment of **Banwari Lal's case (supra)**, arising out of the same notification vide which the land of appellant was acquired.

[7] Learned State Counsel is not in a position to controvert the factual aspect that the main appeal is covered in terms of judgment of **Banwari Lal's case (supra)**; however, opposes payment of interest for the period, the appellants failed to approach this Court after the decision of Reference Court.

[8] I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper-book.

[9] From the records, it is apparent that the present appeal is squarely covered with the judgment of **Banwari Lal's case (supra)**, which is arising out of the same acquisition / Notification dated 14.08.2008 covering the same revenue estate i.e. **Village Kheri Kalan, Tehsil & District Faridabad**, whereby the landowners have been held entitled for the enhanced amount of compensation @ Rs. 2665/- per square yard. For reference, the relevant paras of judgment dated 13/14.07.2021 passed in case of **Banwari Lal's (supra)** (at page Nos. 59 to 61) read as under:-

“ Village : Kheri Kalan

As regards Village Kheri Kalan, covered under the third notification, the High Court has determined the fair market price of lands at Rs.1760/- per sq.yd.

While doing so, the High Court excluded the sale instances pertaining to year 2006, and took note of the sale instances of year 2007. We find that approach is correct. The sale instances in close proximity ought to be reckoned for determining the fair market price.

Reverting to the sale instances of year 2007, it is true that, although, the same have been executed on different dates, the consideration amount is common at Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. That by itself does not make the transaction suspect for being discarded.

If the sale instance of 2006 is taken into account, the consideration was Rs.2273/- per sq.yd. By 2007, particularly, after the first notification was issued in respect of neighboring villages on 01.05.2006, there was bound to be cascading effect on the transactions in the neighboring villages. Perhaps, that may be the reason for rise in the price, referred to in the sale instances of 2007. The first such sale instance is of 12.06.2007 for Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. The other four sale instances of the same year around the same time are also for the same amount. The fact that those sale instances pertain to some developer, cannot be the basis to discard the same by itself, unless there is evidence to suggest that the same have been entered into to get more compensation amount in the event of acquisition of land.

In other words, it is not a speculative transaction. That evidence is lacking in the present case. Hence, we take the sale consideration at Rs.3099/- per sq.yd. as the base price and add 7.5% per annum thereon, as the third notification was issued after one year from the date on which the sale instance was executed.

We further provide deduction at the rate of 20% towards development charges as in the other cases.

As a result, the fair market price for the lands situated in the village Kheri Kalan, covered under the third notification will work out to Rs.2665/- (Rupees two thousand six hundred sixty-five only) per sq.yd. (Rs.3099/- plus Rs.232 minus Rs.666/-).

Hence, the appeal(s) filed by the State challenging the enhancement by the High Court stand rejected, whereas the appeal(s) filed by the claimant(s) for enhancement are partly allowed to the above extent. Rest of the benefits including statutory benefits awarded by the High Court shall remain undisturbed. ”

[9.1] Based upon the above, applying the principle of parity, besides award of just and fair compensation, the landowner / appellant being similarly situated is held entitled for grant of similar amount of compensation as has been awarded to other landowners vide judgment dated 13/14.07.2021 in case of **Banwari Lal (supra)**, alongwith all other statutory benefits and interest thereupon as provided under the Act, except payment of interest for the period the appellant did not approach this Court after passing of Reference Court's Award.

[10] **Disposed off** in the above terms.

Pending application(s), if any, shall stand(s) disposed off.

August 21, 2023

'dk kamra'

**(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE**

Whether Speaking / Reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No