



115

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

(1)

**RFA No. 29 of 2004 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.11.2025**

Akhara Brahm Buta

...Appellant

Versus

Punjab State and another

...Respondents

(2)

RFA No. 3039 of 2006 (O&M)

Taranjit Singh Giani @ Tamjit Singh Giani
(since deceased) through LR's of appellant No. 1
and others

...Appellants

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

(3)

RFA No. 2924 of 2009 (O&M)

Amarjit Singh Giani (since deceased) through
LR's of appellant No. 1 and another

...Appellants

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

(4)

RFA No. 1001 of 1994 (O&M)

Municipal Corporation, Amritsar

...Appellant

Versus

Smt. Mohinder Kaur and others

...Respondents

(5) RFA No. 1696 of 1995 (O&M)

The State of Punjab and another
...Appellants

Versus

Gurbax Singh Uppal and another
...Respondents

(6) RFA No. 2282 of 1995 (O&M)

Punjab State
...Appellant

Versus

Joginder Singh
...Respondent

AND

(7) RFA No. 2283 of 1995 (O&M)

The State of Punjab and another
...Appellants

Versus

Mohinder Singh Bharti and others
...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Tushar Sharma, Advocate with
Mr. Shourya Arora, Advocate,
for the appellant(s)-landowner(s) (in RFA-29-2004)

Mr. Anurag Chopra, Advocate with
Mr. Himanshu Bindal, Advocate
for the appellant(s)-landowner(s)
(in RFA Nos. 3039 of 2006; and 2924 of 2009)

Mr. Gunjan Mehta, Additional Advocate General, Punjab
for the appellant(s) (in RFA Nos. 1696, 2282 & 2283 of 1995) and
for the respondent(s)-State of Punjab
(in RFA Nos. 29 of 2004; 3039 of 2006; 2924 of 2009 & 1001 of 1994)

Mr. Arshdeep Bhullar, Advocate
for the appellant-Municipal Corporation, Amritsar
(in RFA-1001-1994)

Mr. Vikrampreet Arora, Advocate with
Mr. Puneet Bhushan, Advocate
for respondent No. 2-Municipal Corporation, Amritsar
(in RFA-1696-1995)

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

This order shall dispose off the present seven appeals bearing RFA Nos. 29 of 2004; 3039 of 2006; 2924 of 2009; 1001 of 1994; and 1696, 2282 & 2283 of 1995, as the same arise out of common acquisition/award.

[2] In the appeals filed by the landowners, they are seeking further enhancement of compensation for the acquired land, whereas in the appeals filed by the State of Haryana, the prayer is for reduction thereof. Since the common question of law and facts are involved in these appeals, therefore, for the sake of convenience, facts are being culled out from RFA No. 29 of 2004, the appeal filed by the landowner(s).

[3] The appellant-landowner, by instituting the appeal bearing RFA-29-2004, preferred under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (**for short “1894 Act”**), seeks modification of the award dated 05.08.2003 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Amritsar (**hereinafter to be referred as “Reference Court”**) for enhancement of compensation amount.

FACTS

[4] Briefly, the facts are that in pursuance of Punjab Govt. Notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act issued on 02.06.1988, followed by Notification dated 04.06.1988 under Section 6 thereof, certain land of the appellant-landowner, situated within the periphery

of Lal Lakir and comprised of land of Bazar / Gali Chowk Sarai Guru Ram Dass, around Golden Temple Complex, Amritsar, was acquired. The acquisition was made for public purpose, namely, "Beautification Scheme / Galiara Yojna around Golden Temple, Amritsar". The Land Acquisition Collector, Amritsar (**for short "LAC"**) vide Award dated 27.06.1989, assessed the market value at the rate of Rs. 4,400/- per square yard for commercial sites, while assessing Rs. 2,200/- per square yard for residential sites besides grant of other statutory benefits.

[5] Aggrieved thereof, reference petition(s) under Section 18 of the 1894 Act were preferred, wherein besides claiming enhancement of market value, dispute with respect to the area under acquisition was also raised.

[6] Learned Reference Court, vide award dated 05.08.2003, dismissed the claim / reference petition(s) made by the appellant(s)-landowner(s). Hence, the present appeal(s).

CONTENTION(S):

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT(S)-LANDOWNER(S)

[7] At the outset, learned counsel for the appellant(s)-landowner(s), on instructions, submits that they were not agitating the issue / dispute about the area / measurement of the acquired land. However, with respect to the quantum of market value, learned counsel for the appellant(s) submits that vide Award dated 27.06.1989, the LAC assessed the market value at the rate of Rs.4,400/- per square yard and Rs. 2,200/- per square yard for commercial and residential sites respectively by applying annual appreciation at the rate of 12.5% over the base price of Rs. 3,000/-

per square yard for commercial and Rs. 1,500/- per square yard for residential being prevalent during the year 1984 in relation to the properties around the Golden Temple Complex. Relevant portion from the award dated 27.06.1989 passed by the LAC is extracted hereunder:-

"COLLECTOR'S RATE

The learned Financial Commissioner, Revenue, Punjab vide his letter No. 1/76/88-LRI/11313 dated 22.6.1988 has approved the Collector's rate @ Rs. 3000/- per sq. Yard and Rs. 1500/- per Sq. Yard for commercial and residential sites, respectively, in respect of acquisition of Land/properties around Golden Temple Complex, Amritsar.

MARKET VALUE

The market value of the land/structure/property has been pragmatically worked out by the Acquiring Deptt. To arrive at near genuine market value the Acquiring Deptt. i.e. Department of Local Govt. Punjab has taken the compensation of Rs. 3000/- for commercial and Rs. 1500/- per Sq. Yard for residential site paid as compensation on the strength of advice of the Land Acquisition Collector for taking over property around the Golden Temple Complex during 1984 as basis for computing the market price. The Acquiring Deptt. has added 12.5% increase in the price of land in four years and 30% solatium. In this way the compensation cost works out to Rs. 4400/- and 2200/- Per Sq. Yard approximately for commercial and residential sites, respectively."

[7.1] In view of the above, learned counsel thus submits that considering the fact that the acquired land formed part of the centre of the Amritsar City, as such, instead of 12.5%, an appreciation of 15% was required to be awarded. In support, he places reliance upon a

decision rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case "**Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti Sahaswan Distt. Badaun through its Secretary Versus Bipin Kumar & Anr.**", reported as **2004 (1) SCC 283**, whereby an increase of 15% per annum was approved by the Hon'ble Apex Court. Relevant para-8 of the said decision is extracted hereunder:-

" 8. However there is evidence of high potentiality. The increase of 15% given by the High Court cannot therefore be said to be unreasonable. Of course, the 15% increase has to be on Rs. 15.40 which is the figure shown in the sale deed. It cannot be on Rs. 120 as wrongly taken by the High Court. The High Court also erred in considering only three years increase whereas in fact there is four years difference between the respondent's sale deed and the acquisition proceedings. Thus taking an increase of 60% over the price of Rs. 15.40 per sq. yard the value comes to Rs. 24.64 per sq. yard. We accordingly set aside the order of the Reference Court and the High Court and fix value at the rate of Rs. 24.64 per sq. yard. The respondent will also to be entitled to solatium and other statutory benefits under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT(S)-STATE OF PUNJAB

[8] On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent-State submits that there was no evidence available on record with respect to the potential value attached to the acquired land and as such, the impugned award passed by the learned Reference Court called for no interference, the same being based upon proper appreciation of pleadings and the evidence available on record.

DISCUSSION AND REASONING

[9] After hearing learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the paper-book / records, I find substance in the submission(s) made on behalf of the appellant(s)-landowner(s).

[10] Admittedly, the acquisition in hand was for the public purpose, namely, "Beautification Scheme / Galiara Yojna around Golden Temple, Amritsar". A perusal of the Award dated 27.06.1989 passed by the LAC itself shows that the acquired land forms part of Bazar Akaliana and is situated in the close vicinity around Golden Temple Complex. The very purpose of acquisition being for widening of streets and providing for parking places; beautification and re-development of area around Golden Temple Complex ensures that the land under acquisition is abutting and adjoining the Golden Temple Complex. Furthermore, the award passed by the LAC assesses separate market value for commercial area and residential area, which further re-ensures that the part of the acquired land was also being used for commercial activities.

[11] In the wake of the above, it is clearly established that the land under acquisition was having locational and potential advantage attached to it on account of its locational and geographical proximity with the Golden Temple Complex, Amritsar. As such, the LAC while adding simple increase of 12.5% per annum over the price of the property around the Golden Temple Complex during the year 1984 was required to award the same at least on compound basis.

[12] Accordingly, in view of the discussion made hereinabove, by applying the increase per annum at the rate of 12.5% per annum on compound basis, the market price of the acquired land as on the

date of notification under Section 4 of the 1894 Act, i.e. 02.06.1988, comes to **Rs. 4,805/- per square yard** and **Rs. 2,403 per square yard** for commercial and residential sites, respectively, as per calculation below:-

Description	Amount per square yard (in Rs.)			
	Commercial		Residential	
Compensation assessed by the Deptt. of Local Govt. Punjab during 1984		3,000.00		1,500.00
Add: 12.5% @ 12% per annum (1984-1985)	3,000 x 12.5%	375.00	1500 x 12.5%	187.50
		3,375.00		1,687.50
Add: Appreciation @ 12% per annum (1985-1986)	3,375 x 12.5%	421.88	1,687.50 x 12.5%	210.94
		3,796.88		1,898.44
Add: Appreciation @ 12% per annum (1986-1987)	3,796.88 x 12.5%	474.61	1,898.44 x 12.5%	237.30
		4,271.49		2,135.74
Add: Appreciation @ 12% per annum (1987-1988)	4,271.49 x 12.5%	533.94	2,135.74 x 12.5%	266.97
		4,805.43		2,402.71
Net Compensation		4,805.00 (Round off)		2,403.00 (Round off)

DECISION

[13] In view of the aforesaid discussion, impugned award(s) passed by the learned Reference Court is/are modified and the appellant(s)-landowner(s) are held entitled for award of market value at the rate of **Rs. 4,805/- per square yard** and **Rs. 2,403 per square yard** for commercial and residential sites, respectively. The appellant(s)-landowner(s) are also awarded consequential / statutory

benefits and interest as provided in the 1894 Act (as amended up-to-date), especially the interest on solatium as well.

[14] The appeals filed by the **landowners** are **disposed off** accordingly, whereas the appeals filed by the **State of Punjab** and **Municipal Corporation**, Amritsar are hereby **dismissed**.

[15] Also, wherever the landowner(s) has/have unfortunately died in the appeal(s) / cross-objection(s) after filing thereof and the legal representatives have not been impleaded, they shall be at liberty to seek execution of the present decision by moving appropriate application(s) before the learned Executing Court.

[16] Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand(s) disposed off.

November 27, 2025
'dk kamra'

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

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