CGHC010041702021 2026:CGHC:43231

NAFR

PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Digitally signed by PAWAN KUMAR JHA
Date: 2026.10.06 17:57:19 +0530

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WPC No. 896 of 2021

Reserved on: 13.08.2026

Delivered on: 06.10.2026

Uploaded on: 06.10.2026

- Nirmala Bai W/o Late Shri Yashwant Chandrakar Aged About 60 Years R/o Village Bhatagaon, Tahsil Kurud, District Dhamtari Chhattisarh

... Petitioner

versus

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Public Works Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
2. The Secretary, Department Of Revenue And Calamnity Management, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nawa Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
3. Chief Engineer Public Works Department, National Highway Division, Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh
4. The Collector District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh
5. The Sub Divisional Officer (Revenue)/competent Authority (Land Acquisition) Kurud District Dhamtari Chhattisgarh
6. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Road, Transport And Highways New Delhi
7. National Highway Authority Through Project Director, Project Implementation Unit Raipur District Raipur Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Praful N. Bharat, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Akash Pandey, Advocate
For Respondents No. 1 to 5	:	Mr. Atanu Ghosh, Dy. Govt.Advocate
For Respondent No. 7	:	Mr. Dhiraj Wankhede, Advocate with Ms. Anchal Kujur, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Parth Prateem Sahu, Judge

C.A.V. Judgment

1. Petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking following reliefs.

> "10.1 To call for the records of the case for the kind perusal of this Hon'ble Court.
>
> 10.2 To issue an appropriate writ or order and to quash the impugned order dated 07.12.2020 (Annexure P-11) passed by Respondent No. 5.
>
> 10.3 To issue an appropriate writ or order and declare the order dated 07.12.2020 as null and void.
>
> 10.4 To issue an appropriate writ or order and direct the respondent No. 5 to pay interest on award amount at the rate of 15% since the date of land acquisition (possession) till the disbursement as per Section 80 of the Act of 2013
>
> 10.5 Any other relief deemed fit in the facts and circumstances of the case may also be granted."

2. Brief facts of the case relevant for disposal of this petition are that petitioner is owner of the land bearing Khasra No. 1099, 1102 and 1109 admeasuring 0.2300 hect, 0.5700 hect. and 4.0000 hect. respectively situated at village Bhathagaon, P.H. No. 04, Rajasva Nigam Mandal, Kurud, Tah. Kurud, Distt. Dhamtari. Respondent No. 6 has initiated proceedings for acquisition of land for Respondent no. 7 for the purpose of widening of road in between Raipur to Dhamtari (N.H. 30). Notification under Section 3A of the National Highways Act, 1956 (for short "Act of 1956") was issued on 13.03.2015. Notification under Section 3D of the Act of 1956 was published on 08.01.2016 and thereafter following due process of law, award was passed computing the amount of compensation with respect to the land, subject matter of the notification and forming part of the award. Petitioner has earlier filed writ petition bearing WPC No. 2105/2020 pleading therein that she was not being

paid the amount of compensation against the land belonging to petitioner which was acquired. The said writ petition was disposed of vide order dated 30.09.2020 observing that Section 80 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (for short Act of 2013") provides for interest on delayed payment. Liberty was granted to petitioner to approach the concerned authority claiming interest by way of an application and further respondents were directed to ensure that the compensation is to be paid at the earliest within 60 days from the date of receipt of copy of order. Petitioner thereafter had submitted an application before the SDO(R.)-cum-Land Acquisition Officer, competent authority, which was disposed off vide order dated 07.12.2020 (Annexure P-11) observing that petitioner is not entitled for the interest as provided under Section 80 of the Act of 2013. It is this order which is put under challenge in this writ petition.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner would submit that the award was passed on 12.07.2016 and according to the provision applicable to the facts of the case, the amount of compensation was computed by the competent authority by award dated 12.07.2016 has to be disbursed to the respective land owners at the earliest within the time specified. Respondent No. 5 even after making several oral requests and submission of the representation did not disburse the amount awarded in favour of petitioner in the acquisition proceedings. Respondent No. 5 issued memo to the petitioner only on 29.06.2018 ie., after lapse of about 01 year and 6 months without assigning any reason. It is also contended that petitioner was asked to submit affidavit of no litigation only in the year 2020 and thereafter petitioner had submitted an affidavit on 14.02.2020. It is also contended that from the memo placed in writ petition it is appearing that the competent authority for the first time on

29.06.2018 it is informed about passing of award and thereafter the petitioner that submitted affidavit, the amount of compensation is deposited in the account of petitioner on 08.02.2021 after filing of this writ petition. Petitioner is entitled for the interest from the date of publication of the notification under Section 3D of the Act of 1956, from the date of dispossession till the actual payment of made as provided under Section 80 of the Act of 2013. He also contended that respondents though taken a plea that the notice was issued to petitioner for accepting amount of compensation and if for any reason as stated by learned counsel for respondents, petitioner did not appear then it was for the respondents to deposit the same with the authority as provided under Section 64 of the Act of 2013. He also contended that respondents in their return have not made specific pleading as to when National Highways authority or the Central Government has deposited the amount with the competent authority cum land acquisition officer district Dhamtari and in absence of which it will be presumed that the respondents have deposited the amount of compensation just before making payment to petitioner ie., on 08.02.2021. He submits that in the facts of the case petitioner is entitled for the interest. The order passed by the competent authority on the application seeking interest, rejecting the claim is arbitrary, illegal, hence, it be set aside and direction be issued to the respondents to pay the interest from the date of dispossession till the actual payment is made according to the provision under Section 80 of the Act of 2013. In support of his contention, he places reliance upon the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India vs. Pushpavathi (2018) 3 SCC 28, Union of India vs. Tarsem Singh (2019) 9 SCC 304** and the decision of High Court of Gujarat in **Bapusaheb Udesang Raj (D) through LH Ajrudin Bapusaheb Raj and others vs. Competent Authority,**

National Highway Authority of India and Deputy Collector, Bharuch (Expressway) and others in **SCA No. 15262/2025** and connected matters.

4. Mr. Dhiraj Wankhede, learned counsel for Respondent No. 7 would vehemently oppose the submission of learned counsel for petitioner and would submit that the competent authority while considering the application for grant of stay had considered all the facts and circumstances of the case and passed the reasoned and speaking order taking into consideration the evidence/ statement of petitioner also. He contended that after passing of award petitioner was served with a notice under Section 3H of the Act of 1956 asking the petitioner to appear in the office of competent authority on 23.09.2016 at 10:00 am along with documents as mentioned therein. Petitioner was served with three notices because land from three khasra numbers recorded in her name was acquired. It bears signature of petitioner. As per notice, petitioner was required to submit documents related to the land ie., rin pustika/ registry/ khasra B-1 and other relevant documents including bank passbook with IFSC code. Petitioner did not appear before the competent authority pursuant to the notice, which appears to be for the fact that petitioner was indenting higher compensation on the ground that she has already partitioned her property to her children which is reflecting from the application submitted by petitioner before the competent authority on 21.05.2020, Annexure P-5. In the application, petitioner has prayed for grant of compensation to 2-times/4-times. He also pointed out that in the application, petitioner has pleaded that she is entitled for the compensation according to computation of her land in square feet, however, the computation is made on hectare basis. It is for this reason, petitioner did not appear before the competent authority pursuant to

notice issued under Section 3H of the Act of 1956 for accepting the compensation with relevant documents as mentioned therein. He contended that according to the policy, amount of compensation against the land looser is to be deposited directly in their bank account. As the petitioner has not submitted documents as mentioned in the notice under Section 3H of the Act of 1956 along with bank details, the amount of compensation could not be deposited. Hence, the respondents-State authorities or the national highways authority cannot be held to be at fault in not depositing the amount of compensation due by the competent authority in its award. He submits that in the affidavit submitted by petitioner under Order XVIII Rule 4 CPC on 19.11.2020, she had made statement that she was informed about the award by a letter but the mutual partition has ben taken place between her and her children prior to passing of the award and it was informed to the concerned authorities vide letter dated 24.01.2017. He also submits that in para-4 of the affidavit there is mention that there was settlement between her and her children and since 2018 she is requesting with the department to pay the amount of compensation, which says that for the first time the request was made in the month of July 2018 for payment of compensation, however, petitioner has not deposited the requested documents before the competent authority as there is mention in the affidavit in this regard. It is contention of learned counsel for the respondents that the interest as provided under Section 80 is a default interest and is to be paid only when there is default on the part of the competent authority of not making payment of the amount of compensation immediately after passing of the award which in the facts of the case is not attracted because immediately after passing of the award, notice under Section 3H of the Act of 1956 was issued to petitioner along with other villagers. He also contended

that from the memo dated 29.06.2018 issued to petitioner by the competent authority it appearing that petitioner had earlier submitted an application before the competent authority for making payment of compensation passed on mutual partition and in that regard memo was issued to petitioner informing that petitioner can file proceedings under Section 3G(5) of the Act of 1956 before the arbitrator and also informed that Upper Collector, District Dhamtari has been appointed as Arbitrator. He also read over to the findings recorded by the competent authority in deciding the application submitted by petitioner for grant of interest and would submit that there is acceptance and admission on the part of petitioner that he was served with the notice as also the admission made that on 24.01.2017 she submitted an application for correcting the award of compensation as the amount of compensation is computed at hectare rate basis and further admission on the part of petitioner that she did not appear before the competent authority along with relevant documents. Further, the finding recorded by the competent authority that she admitted that in the notice there is specific mention that the land owner is required to appear along with relevant documents mandatorily. He submits that the amount of compensation is to be paid in accordance with the provision under Section 3 of the Act of 1956. Section 3D provides for grant of interest also, however, petitioner could not able to make out a case for grant of interest.

5. Learned State counsel would submit that under the Act of 2013, Section 76 provides for ‘Disputes as to Apportionment’. As there is pleading in the application submitted by petitioner that there was mutual partition between her and her children, petitioner has to file appropriate proceeding before the appropriate authority.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and also perused the record of the writ petition.

7. Claim of the petitioner in this writ petition is with respect to the interest on the amount of compensation awarded towards land acquisition under the Act of 1956 alleging that there was delay in payment of amount of compensation on the part of the authorities.

8. It is not in dispute that the land bearing Khasra Nos. 1099, 1102 and 1109 admeasuring 0.2300 hect, 0.5700 hect. and 4.0000 hect. respectively situated at village Bhathagaon, P.H. No. 04, Rajasva Nigam Mandal, Kurud, Tah. Kurud, Distt. Dhamtari were the affected land and were subject matter of the acquisition of land acquisition proceeding initiated by the respondents-authorities after following due process of law under the Act of 1956. The competent authority passed an award on 12.07.2016 in Land Acquisition Case No. 12/A-82/15-16 determining the amount of compensation against the land, subject matter of the acquisition, total admeasuring 28033 sq.mt. (including the land of petitioner) of Rs. 14,36,77,471.

9. To appreciate the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner that though award has been passed on 12.07.2016 but the amount of compensation is paid not prior to 08.02.2021, I have examined the facts reflecting from the documents, with circumspection.

10. Before proceeding further, I find it appropriate to extract the relevant provisions of law under which the land acquisition proceeding was drawn and the provision under which the petitioner claimed interest.

11. From the face of the award Annexure P-2, it is apparent that the acquisition authority has been shown as the Project Director, National Highway Authority, Implementation Unit, Raipur. Contents of the award

would show that the proceeding of acquisition is started by issuing notice under Section 3A of the Act of 1956 and thereafter following due process of law as provided under Section 3 of the Act of 1956, the award was passed.

12. Section 3A of the Act of 1956 talks of Power to Acquire Land, etc.; Section 3B deals with Power to Enter for Survey, etc.; Section 3C provides for Hearing of Objections; Section 3D provides for Declaration of Acquisition; Section 3E envisages Power to Take Possession; Section 3G provides for Determination of the amount payable as Compensation; Section 3G(5) provides for the remedy to the party to submit an application by either of the parties before the Arbitrator to be appointed by the Central Government, if such a party is not accepting the amount of compensation so determined. Section 3H talks of Deposit and payment of amount. Under Section 3H(1), it is provided that the amount determined under Section 3G shall be deposited by the Central Government with the competent authority before taking possession of the land. Section 3H(2) provides that the competent authority to pay the amount of compensation on behalf of Central Government so deposited with it under sub-section 1 of Section 3H. Caluse 6 of Section 3H provides for the amount to be deposited along with interest if the amount determined by the Arbitrator is in excess of the amount determined by the competent authority.

13. The Competent Authority is defined under Section 3(a) of the Act of 1956 and is reproduced below:

> "**3. Definitions**.—
> (a) "competent authority" means any person or authority authorised by the Central Government, by notification in the Official Gazette, to perform the functions of the competent authority for such area as may be specified in the notification;"

14. With respect to the subject matter of this writ petition/ proceeding, the competent authority under land acquisition was Sub-Divisional Officer (R.), Kurud, District Dhamtari. The Act of 1956 is a Code in itself as under Section 3(J) it is provided that 'Nothing in the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 shall apply to an acquisition under this Act'. Section 105 of the Act of 2013 provides that 'Provisions of this Act not to apply in certain cases or to apply with certain modifications'. Under sub-section 1 of Section 105, it provides that 'subject to sub-section (3), the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the enactments relating to land acquisition specified in the Fourth Schedule'. Under sub-section 3 it is envisaged that the Central Government shall, by notification, within one year from the date of commencement of this Act, direct that any of the provisions of this Act relating to the determination of compensation in accordance with the First Schedule and rehabilitation and resettlement specified in the Second and Third Schedules, being beneficial to the affected families, shall apply to the cases of land acquisition under the enactments specified in the Fourth Schedule or shall apply with such exceptions or modifications that do not reduce the compensation or dilute the provisions of this Act relating to compensation or rehabilitation and resettlement as may be specified in the notification, as the case may be. Notification under Section 105 has been published in the Gazette notification dated 28.08.2015. By the notification, provisions of the Act of 2013 relating to determination of compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement were made applicable to the cases of land acquisition under the said enactments in the interest of the land owners has been made applicable to the land acquisition under the enactments forming part of Fourth Schedule and have made an order in exercise of the powers under

Section 113 of the Act of 2013 as known as Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Removal of Difficulties) Order, 2015 (henceforth referred to as “Order, 2015”). Para-2 of the order provides that the provisions of the Act of 2013 relating to determination of compensation in accordance with the First Schedule, rehabilitation and resettlement in accordance with the Second Schedule and infrastructure amenities in Third schedule shall apply to all cases in land acquisition under the enactments specifies under the Fourth Schedule.

15. From the aforementioned relevant provisions of the law as discussed and further the provisions in the Order, 2015, it is apt clear that First, Second and the Third Schedule appended to the Act of 2013 are made applicable to the land acquisition proceedings in different enactments as forming part of Fourth Schedule. Act of 1956 is placed at Sr. No. 7 of the Fourth Schedule. First schedule provides for the components to be considered to constitute the minimum compensation package to be given to those whose land is acquired and to tenants referred to in Clause-C of Section 3 in proportion decided by the appropriate Government. Schedule-1 includes market value of the land- to be determined as provided under Section 26; factor by which the market value is to be determined in case of rural and urban areas; value of assets attached to land or building to be determined as provided under Section 29; Solatium. Second schedule of the Act of 2013 deals with “Elements of Rehabilitation and Resettlement Entitlements for all the affected families (both land owners and the families whose livelihood is primarily dependent on land acquired) in addition to those provided in the First Schedule. Third Schedule of the Act of 2013 deals with ‘Provision of Infrastructural Amenities’.

16. Petitioner in this writ petition is claiming interest on the ground that the award was passed on 12.07.2016 but the amount of compensation has not been paid to her immediately after passing of award, meaning thereby the claim of interest is on the ground of delayed payment of compensation. The acquisition of land of petitioner is under provision of Act of 1956.

17. Section 3 deals with ‘competent authority’ and the procedure for the acquisition determining of the compensation, deposit and payment of amount of compensation and further the procedure for any of the purpose, challenge the award if anything of them is not specified and the procedure to settle the dispute. Section 3H(5) provides for the interest @ 9% p.a. on such excess amount from the date of taking possession under section 3D till the date of the actual deposit thereof. Section 3H(1) envisages that the amount determined under section 3G shall be deposited by the Central Government in such manner as may be laid down by rules made in this behalf by that Government, with the competent authority before taking possession of the land.

18. Pursuant to the order passed by this Court, Respondent No. 7 had submitted an affidavit on 13.08.2026 mentioning that the date of passing of the award is 12.07.2016 and the date of taking possession of the land is 16.12.2016.

19. Petitioner has earlier filed a writ petition before this Court bearing WPC No. 2105/2020 alleging inaction on the part of respondents in not paying compensation, against the land belonging to petitioner which has been acquired and in that order there is observation that for the purpose of claiming interest petitioner had the liberty to approach the concerned authorities claiming for the same by way of an application and the

authority shall consider and decide the application for grant of interest also. After passing of the order in the writ petition on 30.09.2020, petitioner submitted an application before the competent authority land acquisition-cum-SDO(R.) which was decided by the authorities vide impugned order dated 07.12.2020 (Annexure P-11).

20. The competent authority while considering the application submitted by petitioner claiming interest have taken into consideration and have mentioned in the order that notice was issued to petitioner informing her that she shall appear on 23.09.2016 at 10:00 AM in the office of SDO(R.)-cum-competent authority land acquisition for disbursement of the amount of compensation. The said notice was served upon the petitioner through the Kotwar of the village, is also specifically been mentioned in the order. Copy of the notice is filed by respondent-State in its rely as Annexure R-1. Perusal of Annexure R-1 would show that this notice is issued mentioning the description of the property and name and owner of the land (ie., petitioner) under Section 3H of the Act of 1956 for her appearance on 23.09.2016 at 10:00 AM. The notice Annexure R-1 also bears signature of petitioner. Receipt of notice issued under Section 3H by the petitioner is not disputed by petitioner. In the notice, it is clearly mentioned that the land owner has to deposit six documents as mentioned therein which includes copy of bank passbook with account number and IFSC code.

21. Petitioner had submitted an affidavit under Order XVIII Rule 4 CPC before the competent authority land acquisition -cum-SDO(R.), stating that the notice was given to petitioner of disbursement of the amount of compensation and further that partition of land recorded in her name has been given in partition to her sons and daughters. The objection was

raised, and to decide the objection, the Arbitrator has been appointed. When petitioner approached, she was informed that compensation is to be paid double the value of the land, but she is entitled for four times of the value of land. Petitioner has also enclosed letter dated 29.06.2018 (Annexure P-9) which is addressed to petitioner, wherein it is mentioned that petitioner has not submitted any objection within specified time on the compensation determined and accordingly the award was passed on 12.07.2016 and further informed her that if she is having any objection on the compensation determined then to raise objection before the Collector who is appointed as an Arbitrator officer (NHAI).

22. During the proceeding, the SDO(R.) has also recorded statement/ evidence of petitioner and based on the evidence and discussion, she was cross examined. In cross-examination, she admitted that she received notice of disbursement of amount of compensation by the authority on 23.09.2016 and further admitted that pursuant to the notice, she did not appear before the SDO(R.) on 23.09.2016 to collect the amount of compensation. There is further admission that for the first time, she appeared in the court of SDO(R.)-cum-competent authority land acquisition on 19.11.2020 ie., on the date fixed for her cross-examination. Though, she made statement that relevant documents as mentioned in the notice under Section 3H was submitted, however, she is not aware with respect to the date of submission of those documents. She also admitted that in the notice there was mentioned that land owner himself/ herself has to appear along with relevant documents for collecting the amount of compensation. The SDO(R.) while considering the application submitted by petitioner has discussed the facts and circumstances as also the evidence and the relevant documents available in record in detail and upon minute analysis of the facts and evidence has come to the

conclusion that the petitioner was also served with a notice to collect the amount of compensation as served to the other land owners whose lands were acquired in the same land acquisition proceeding and the award was passed, however, petitioner has not taken any interest for receiving the amount of compensation and therefore she is not entitled for the interest in accordance with the provision under Section 80 of the Act of 2013.

23. Section 80 of the Act of 2013 deals with ‘Payment of Interest’ which provides that “When the amount of such compensation is not paid or deposited on or before taking possession of the land, the Collector shall pay the amount awarded with interest thereon at the rate of nine per cent. per annum from the time of so taking possession until it shall have been so paid or deposited.”

24. From perusal of provision under Section 80 itself it is apparent that the land owner shall be entitled for the interest only when the amount of such compensation is not paid or deposited.

25. In the case at hand, undisputedly after passing of the award on 12.07.2016 immediately thereafter notice was issued to the land owners whose lands were acquired and the compensation determined to appear before the competent authority with relevant documents and to receive the amount of compensation. Persons/ land owners who appeared before the competent authority pursuant to the notice and submitted relevant documents as mentioned therein, the compensation determined as per award was disbursed to them in their bank account. Transfer of amount of compensation in bank account of the concerned land owners is pursuant to the procedure adopted by the Union of India to avoid any malpractice and to protect the interest of the land owners so that they

may receive the entire amount of compensation so computed directly in their bank account. On the date of passing of the award, notification issued by the Ministry of Surface Transport (Roads Wing) dated 04.01.1999 was prevailing which is known as “National Highways (manner of depositing the amount by the Central Government with the competent authority for acquisition of land) Rules, 1998” (for short “Rules of 1998”). Rule 2 of the said Rules, 1998 provides that the competent authority shall deposit the amount received under sub-rule (1) in a separate Public Deposit Account in the Public Account of India and the provision of sub-section(2) to (4) of Section 3H of the Act of 1956 shall apply to such deposit.

26. It is not the case of petitioner that after the amount determined by the land acquisition officer towards compensation was deposited with the competent authority, the competent authority had not issued notice to the land owners for payment of amount of compensation or that the notice was not received by the petitioner. Petitioner after receipt of notice of disbursement of amount, when herself has avoided to receive the amount of compensation and non-payment of compensation is attributed to petitioner herself then she will not be permitted to claim interest on the amount of compensation which is payable only when, the Government fails to deposit the amount with the competent authority or the amount so deposited is not paid to the land owners. Under the Rules of 1998, there is no provision that the competent authority after receipt of amount and deposited in Public Account is further required to deposit the amount if not received by the land owners and pending due before any other authority and therefore the submission of learned counsel for petitioner that the competent authority-land acquisition has not deposited the unpaid balance amount in its account with the authority under Section 64

of the Act of 2013, in the opinion of this Court, in view of the scheme of the Act of 1956 as also the provisions under Section 105 of the Act of 2013 is not sustainable and accordingly it is repelled.

27. So far as decision in the case of **Bapusaheb Udesang Raj (supra)** which was relied upon by the learned counsel for petitioner is concerned, in that case full amount of compensation was not paid or deposited prior to taking of possession of lands in question. In the said case, the Court was considering the amount of interest payable on the unpaid amount of compensation which was enhanced pursuant to the application of multiplier and therefore the said case is distinguishable on facts. In the present case, the amount of compensation was deposited with the competent authority and non-payment of amount of compensation was attributable to the petitioner herself as she after receipt of notice from the competent authority for disbursement of compensation, did not appear and submitted relevant documents including Bank account details.

28. So far as decision in case of **Mohd. Shahid and others vs. Union of India** in WRIT-C No. 16025 of 2024 decided on 04.07.2024 by Division Bench of Allahabad High Court is concerned, in that case the compensation amount had not been approved nor transmitted to the account of the competent authority; there the non-payment was attributable due to non-approval and non-transmission of the compensation amount to the competent authority, whereas in the case at hand, after passing of the award, the amount determined towards compensation was deposited with the competent authority and notice was issued to the land owners by the competent authority-land acquisition for disbursement of the amount of compensation, of which notice was duly received by the petitioner. Thus, the said decision will not be applicable to the facts of present case.

29. For the foregoing discussion, particularly in view of the fact that the amount of compensation determined under the award was deposited with the competent authority and the petitioner was duly served with notice for receiving the amount of compensation but did not appear before the competent authority pursuant to the said notice, I do not find any error, infirmity or illegality in the order Annexure P-11 dated 07.12.2020 passed by the SDO(R.), Kurud dismissing the claim of interest on the amount of compensation.

30. Writ petition being devoid of any substance is liable to be and is hereby dismissed accordingly.

No order as to cost.

Sd/-

(Parth Prateem Sahu)

pwn **JUDGE**