WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON : 28.10.2026

PRONOUNCED ON : 17.11.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE S. SOUNTHAR

Case QR

CRP.Nos.3387, 3422, 3392, 3413, 3425, 3424, 3439, 3417, 3416, 3426, 3427, 3407, 3398, 3389, 3388, 3409, 3397, 3410, 3421, 3415, 3423, 3418, 3411, 3420, 3394 and 3419 of 2026

CNR:{HCMA010868022026}

and

CMP.Nos.14812, 14817, 14823, 14771, 14807, 14828, 14742, 14799, 14794, 14747, 14809, 14754, 14835, 14750, 14818, 14805, 14815, 14821, 14937, 14803, 14804, 14768, 14745, 14808, 14843, 14825 of 2026

CRP.No.3387 of 2026:

1. The Special District Revenue Officer (LA)-2,
   Highways, (NH 205 and SH 58 SCKAT roads),
   Tiruvallur 602 001.

2. The Divisional Engineer (C and M)
   Chennai Greater City Roads Division-2,
   Highways Department,
   Arumbakkam, Chennai.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Sampath

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This Civil Revision Petition is filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the Judgment and Decree in LAOP.No.771 of 2025, dated 28.11.2025 on the file of the Principal District Judge at Tiruvallur.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

For Petitioners : Mr.P.V.Balasubramaniam
Additional Advocate General
Assisted by Mr.P.Sunil,
Government Advocate
(in all CRPs)

For Respondent : M/s.S.Ravikumar
M/s.R.M.Soniya
(in all CRPs)

COMMON ORDER

These Civil Revision Petitions are filed challenging the order passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur, partly allowing the Land Acquisition Original Petitions filed by the respondents/land owners seeking enhancement of compensation fixed for the lands acquired by the 1st petitioner/Land Acquisition Officer for the benefit of the 2nd respondent/Requisitioning Body.

2. The subject lands which are agricultural lands belonged to the respondents were acquired for the purpose of formation of link road to connect NH 205 with SH 58 SCKAT Road. The 1st petitioner/Land Acquisition Officer fixed the compensation amount at the rate of Rs.1,077.04/- per sq. meter for the Punjai Maanavari Lands Type-I, Rs.247.10/- per sq. meter for Punjai Special Type-III, Rs.1,853.25/- per sq. meter for Punjai Type-I Well Irrigation,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Rs.7,372.94/- per sq. meter for Residential Area Special-5, Type-1, Rs.1,076.40/- per sq. meter for Nanjai Single Crop Type-I Lake Irrigation and Rs.741.30/- per sq. meter for Nanjai Special Type-I and passed an award. Not satisfied with the quantum of compensation fixed by the Land Acquisition Officer, the respondents/land owners sought for reference and on reference made by the 1st petitioner, the cases were numbered as Land Acquisition Original Petitions before the Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur. The said Land Acquisition Original Petitions were partly allowed by the Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur by enhancing the compensation to Rs.10,760/- per sq. meter. The learned Principal District Judge also directed the application of multiplier of 1.25, payment of additional compensation and 100% solatium etc. Aggrieved by the said order passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur, the Land Acquisition Officer and Requisitioning Body have come before this Court by way of filing these civil revision petitions.

3. The learned Additional Advocate General appearing for the petitioners would contend that the learned Principal District Judge by relying on the compensation amount fixed by this Court in respect of Residential Type-I Land, erroneously enhanced the compensation in respect of agricultural lands. He also submitted that the acquired lands are situated in Urban Area namely Tiruttani Town and therefore, the Principal District Judge ought to have applied only the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

multiplier of 1 instead of 1.25 in terms of Schedule-I of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter called as 'the Right to Fair Compensation Act' for brevity). It is also submitted that the learned Principal District Judge directed additional compensation amount at the rate of 12% per annum on the cumulative compensation amount arrived at after multiplication of the market value with the factor mentioned under Serial No.2 to Schedule-I of the Right to Fair Compensation Act, instead of awarding additional compensation at the rate of 12% per annum only on the market value. It is also submitted that the learned Principal District Judge committed an error in ordering 100% solatium on the cumulative of the compensation amount arrived at after multiplication of the market value with the factor and also after addition of the compensation amount in terms of Section 30 (3) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act instead of ordering solatium on the market value.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents/land owners by relying on the Ex.P1-Guideline Value Extract of Tiruttani Village would submit that the learned Principal District Judge by rightly relying on the guideline value fixed by the Government, enhanced the compensation amount and the same requires no interference. The learned counsel also submitted that in respect of land owners affected by the same notification, the Court enhanced the

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

compensation to Rs.1,000/- per sq.ft. (Rs.10,760/- per sq. meter in L.A.O.P.No.205 of 2019) and the said order was confirmed by this Court in revision in CRP.No.2876 of 2022 and also by the Apex Court in a special leave petition. Therefore, according to the learned counsel, the Principal District Judge rightly relied on the order passed by this Court and the Apex Court and enhanced the compensation amount. It is also submitted that the subject lands are situated within 1.5 kilometre from Tiruttani Railway Station and Temple. Therefore, the compensation amount fixed by the Land Acquisition Officer is very much on the lower side. As far as the submission made by the learned Additional Advocate General for the petitioners with regard to the usage of factor 1.25, awarding of additional compensation under Section 30 (3) and solatium on the entire compensation amount etc., the learned counsel for the respondents has no serious objections.

5. A perusal of the award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer, typed-set of papers and the relevant records would indicate that the Land Acquisition Officer while calculating the compensation for the acquired lands had dealt with the following six types of lands:-

(i) Punjai Maanavari Lands Type-I (dry rainfed land)
(ii) Punjai Special Type-III
(iii) Punjai Type-I (Well Irrigation)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(iv) Residential Area Special-5, Type-1

(v) Nanjai Single Crop Type-I (Lake Irrigation) and

(vi) Nanjai Special Type-I

The Land Acquisition Officer fixed the compensation at the rate of Rs.1,077.04/-, Rs.247.10/-, Rs.1,853.25/-, Rs.7,372.94/-, Rs.1,076.40/- and Rs.741.30/- per sq. meter respectively. Therefore, it is clear that the compensation payable to the land owners depends on type of lands, which are acquired. In the case on hand, the learned Principal District Judge by relying on Ex.P1-Guideline Register and the order passed by this Court in earlier revision filed by some other land owner in respect of Residential Type-I Land fixed the compensation amount at Rs.1,000 per sq.ft., (Rs.10,760/- per sq. meter).

6. In these batch of civil revision petitions, we are having 26 cases. The civil revision petition numbers, survey numbers, area acquired and classification of the respective lands are given below in a tabular column:-

S. No.	***CRP.Nos.***	***Survey Nos.***	***Area (Sq.Mts.)***	***Classification of Land***
1.	*3387 of 2026*	*220/18B2*	*840*	
2.	*3388 of 2026*	*220/2B* *222/12A2B2*	*900* *460* *(1360)*	
3.	*3392 of 2026*	*326/4B* *326/9B*	*350* *760* *(1110)*	
4.	*3394 of 2026*	*326/3B*	*2497*	
5.	*3397 of 2026*	*220 /25B2*	*150*	
6.	*3398 of 2026*	*220 /25C2*	*130*	

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7.	3409 of 2026	326/3B	1781	Dry Maanavari Lands Type -I
8.	3410 of 2026	222/12B7B	500	
9.	3411 of 2026	166/22B1 166/22C2 166/23B1	1245 685 120 (2050)	
10.	3413 of 2026	220/7B	360	
11.	3416 of 2026	220/24	750	
12.	3417 of 2026	222/8C2 222/11B	350 480 (830)	
13.	3418 of 2026	220/14A2	65	
14.	3419 of 2026	166/6B 166/7B 166/8B 166/11A	655 450 1720 910 (3735)	
15.	3423 of 2026	326/5B 326/6B 326/7B	430 1720 610 (2760)	
16.	3439 of 2026	166/22A2 166/23A	685 400 (1085)	
17.	3425 of 2026	222/23B	165	
18.	3415 of 2026	217/8B	900	Dry Well Irrigation Type – I
19.	3420 of 2026	220/18A2	620	
20.	3421 of 2026	220/13B	330	
21.	3407 of 2026	217/9B 217/2B2	1830 1900	Dry Well Irrigation Type – I (217/9B) Wet Lake Irrigation Single Crop Type – I (217/2B2)
22.	3389 of 2026	179/10B	40	Wet Lake Irrigation Single Crop Type – I
23.	3424 of 2026	178/9B	520	
24.	3426 of 2026	222/6B2	470	Dry Special Type – III
25.	3427 of 2026	222/6A2	530	
26.	3422 of 2026	323/2A1B	1940	Dry Land as per 15(2) notification. Residential land as per award.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Therefore, it is clear that all the lands which are subject matter of the various civil revision petitions are not classified as Residential Area Type-I. The land in C.R.P.No.3422 of 2026 is classified as dry land in Section 15(2) notification and treated as Residential Area Special-5, Type-I, in the award passed by 1st respondent.

7. The land in Civil Revision Petition No.3422 of 2026 is treated as Residential Area Special-5, Type-I by the Land Acquisition Officer and he fixed compensation at Rs.7,372.94/- per sq. meter. If we see the Section 15(2) notification, the subject matter of land in C.R.P.No.3422 of 2026 has been described only as a 'dry land'. It is not clear that on what basis the Land Acquisition Officer treated the land in C.R.P.No.3422 of 2026 as a Residential Area Special-5, Type-I. In fact, Ex.P1-Guideline Register produced by the respondents/land owners, the guideline value for the lands concerned with these revisions are not available. When the subject matter of the present Civil Revision Petitions are agricultural lands and not residential land, the learned Principal District Judge has committed error in relying on Ex.P1-Guideline Value for Residential Area Special-5, Type-I lands.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

8. Section 26 (1) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act reads as follows:-

"26. Determination of market value of land by Collector.-(1) The Collector shall adopt the following criteria in assessing and determining the market value of the land, namely:-

(a) the market value, if any, specified in the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) for the registration of sale deeds or agreements to sell, as the case may be, in the area, where the land is situated; or

(b) the average sale price for similar type of land situated in the nearest village or nearest vicinity area; or

(c) consented amount of compensation as agreed upon under sub-section (2) of section 2 in case of acquisition of lands for private companies or for public private partnership projects,

whichever is higher:

Provided that the date for determination of market value shall be the date on which the notification has been issued under section 11.

Explanation 1.- The average sale price referred to in clause (b) shall be determined taking into account the sale deeds or the agreements to sell registered for similar type of area in the near village or near vicinity area during immediately preceding three years of the year in which such acquisition of land is proposed to be made.

Explanation 2.- For determining the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1, one-half of the total number of sale

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

deeds or the agreements to sell in which the highest sale price has been mentioned shall be taken into account.

Explanation 3.- While determining the market value under this section and the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1 or Explanation 2, any price paid as compensation for land acquired under the provisions of this Act on an earlier occasion in the district shall not be taken into consideration.

Explanation 4.- While determining the market value under this section and the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1 or Explanation 2, any price paid, which in the opinion of the Collector is not indicative of actual prevailing market value may be discounted for the purposes of calculating market value."

9. A perusal of the provision under Section 26(1)(a) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act would make it clear that the guideline value for the land situated in the area may be the basis for determination of market value. However, the guideline value maintained by the Registration Department for a different type of land namely the Residential Type-I cannot be the basis for determining the market value for agricultural punja lands with source of irrigation or without source of irrigation. In Ex.P1 produced by the petitioners, the guideline value for the survey numbers of the subject properties or guideline value for similar type of lands are not produced. The learned Principal District Judge has committed an error in taking into consideration the guideline value

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

fixed for Residential Type-I land for agricultural dry lands with or without irrigation source. Therefore, the order passed by the Court below with regard to the determination of market value needs interference.

10. Section 26 (2) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act, reads as follows:-

> "*(2) The market value calculated as per sub-section (1) shall be multiplied by a factor to be specified in the First Schedule.*"

11. A perusal of Schedule I to the said Act would make it clear that in case the subject matter of the acquisition is situated within the urban area, the multiplication factor shall be '1' and in case where the land is situated in non-urban area, the multiplication factor will vary from 1 to 2 based on the distance of the project from the urban area, as may be notified by the Government. In the case on hand, the acquired lands are situated in an urban area (i.e., Tiruttani Town).

12. A perusal of the evidence of RW.1 would indicate that the properties are situated within 1.5 kilometres from Tiruttani Railway Station and Temple. Therefore, the applicable multiplier as per the Schedule-I to the Act is 1. The learned Principal District Judge erroneously applied multiplier of 1.25. Hence,

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

the direction of the learned Principal District Judge to apply multiplier of 1.25 is set aside and the market value arrived at shall be multiplied by multiplication factor of 1.

13. Section 30 (3) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act reads as follows:-

> *"30.(3) In addition to the market value of the land provided under section 26, the Collector shall, in every case, award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve per cent. per annum on such market value for the period commencing on and from the date of the publication of the notification of the Social Impact Assessment study under sub-section (2) of section 4, in respect of such land, till the date of the award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier."*

14. Therefore, it is clear that apart from the market value arrived at as per Section 26, the land owners are entitled to additional compensation at the rate of 12% per annum on such market value commencing from the date of publication of the Social Impact Assessment Study notification under Section 4(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act till the date of award passed by the District Collector or date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier. In the case on hand, the learned Principal District Judge passed direction for additional compensation at the rate of 12% per annum on the cumulative value arrived at

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

after multiplication of market value with the factor mentioned in Schedule-I to the Act.

15. A plain reading of Section 30 (3) of the Right to Fair Compensation Act would make it clear that the additional compensation amount shall be calculated at the rate of 12% per annum on the market value arrived under Section 26 of the Right to Fair Compensation Act. The higher value arrived at after applying the multiplication factor shall not be the basis for calculating additional compensation. Hence, the said direction issued by the learned Principal District Judge is set aside and the additional compensation shall be calculated at the rate of 12% per annum only on the market value of the acquired lands arrived at under Section 26 of the said Act.

16. Section 30 (1) and (2) and Schedule-I of the Right to Fair Compensation Act, are relevant for the purpose of determination of solatium payable to the land owners. The relevant provisions read as follows:-

> *"30 (1) and (2) The Collector having determined the total compensation to be paid, shall, to arrive at the final award, impose a "Solatium" amount equivalent to one hundred per cent of the compensation amount.*
>
> *Explanation.- For the removal of doubts it is hereby declared that solatium amount shall be in addition to the compensation payable to any person whose land has been acquired.*

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

(2) The Collector shall issue individual awards detailing the particulars of compensation payable and the details of payment of the compensation as specified in the First Schedule."

17. Entry No.5 in Schedule-I to the Right to Fair Compensation Act, reads as follows:-

Serial number	*Component of compensation package in respect of land acquired under the Act*	*Manner of determination of value*	*Date of determination of value*
(1)	*(2)*	*(3)*	*(4)*
5.	*Solatium*	*Equivalent to one hundred per cent of the market value of land mentioned against serial number 1 multiplied by the factor specified against serial number 2 for rural areas or serial number 3 for urban areas plus value of assets attached to land or building against serial number 4 under column (2).*	

18. A perusal of the above provision would make it clear that after arriving at market value under Section 26 of the Right to Fair Compensation Act, the amount of compensation payable, shall be determined by adding total amount of compensation to be paid to the land owner by including the value of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

all the assets attached to the acquired land in terms of Section 27 of the Right to Fair Compensation Act. After adding the market value arrived at under Section 26 with the values of the assets arrived at under Section 27, the solatium payable to the land owners shall be calculated either by applying the multiplication factor for non-urban areas as per Serial No.2 to Schedule-I or factor "1" applicable to urban areas as per Serial No.3 to Schedule-I.

19. In the case on hand, the learned Principal District Judge directed calculation of 100% solatium on the cumulative value arrived at by multiplying the market value with factor mentioned in Schedule-I, plus additional compensation payable under Section 30 (3) of the Act. The additional compensation payable under Section 30 (3) of the Act shall not be included while calculating the solatium. The solatium shall be calculated only on the amount arrived at after multiplication of figure calculated under Section 26 of the Right to Fair Compensation Act together with value of the assets arrived at under Section 27, by factor mentioned under Schedule-I. Therefore, the said direction issued by the learned Principal District Judge is set aside and it is made clear that the solatium of 100% shall be calculated based on the value arrived at under Sections 26 and 27 of the Right to Fair Compensation Act and then multiplied by factor 1. Therefore, the directions issued by the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur, in Clause-(ii), (iii) and (iv) of the decree are set aside and modified as indicated above.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

20. In the light of the above discussion, this Court comes to the conclusion that the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur has committed an error in taking into consideration the Guideline Value mentioned in Ex.P1 for Residential Special Type-I and fixing the compensation for the subject lands which are Dry Lands with source of irrigation or without source of irrigation.

21. The order passed by this Court in C.R.P.No.2876 of 2022 was related to the Residential Land Type-I category and the subject matter of all these revisions are not Residential Land Type-I category but all these lands are Dry Maanavari Lands or Dry Lands with source of irrigation. The guideline value meant for Residential Type-I cannot be applied for different class of lands. Therefore, the impugned order passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur, is set aside and the matter is remanded back to the file of the Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur, for fresh consideration after giving opportunity to the parties to lead evidence in respect of their claim. It is made clear in respect of C.R.P.No.3422 of 2026, the subject property was described or dry land in Section 15(2) notification. However, the Land Acquisition Officer treated it as Residential Area Type-I. While considering the LAOP afresh, the parties are at liberty to lead evidence and clarify this discrepancy.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

22. Accordingly, all these Civil Revision Petitions are allowed by setting aside the order passed by the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur in Land Acquisition Original Petitions and all the Land Acquisition Original Petitions are remanded back to the file of same Court with a direction to fix the compensation amount payable to the land owners by taking into consideration the type of lands acquired. Both the parties are at liberty to lead any further evidence. Taking into consideration the Section 15(2) notification was issued on 22.06.2013, the learned Principal District Judge, Tiruvallur is directed to dispose of all the Land Acquisition Original Petitions in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible, within a period of six months from the date of receipt of copy of this order. No costs. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petitions are closed.

17.11.2026

Index: Yes
Speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes
dm

Note:The Registry is directed to issue order copy by incorporating the cause title in all cases.

To

The Principal District Court,
Tiruvallur.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

2026:MHC:4700

Order QR

WEB COPY

S.SOUNTHAR J.

dm

Pre-Delivery Common Order made in CRP.Nos.3387, 3422, 3392, 3413, 3425, 3424, 3439, 3417, 3416, 3426, 3427, 3407, 3398, 3389, 3388, 3409, 3397, 3410, 3421, 3415, 3423, 3418, 3411, 3420, 3394 and 3419 of 2026

17.11.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis