

\226?REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10831 OF 2016

[ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO.22231 OF 2015)

ASHOK KUMAR & ORS. .â- |APPELLANTS

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ANR.

....RESPONDENTS

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10832 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.22232/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10833 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.22233/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10834 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.22238/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10835 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.22239/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10836 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.30715/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10838 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.32064/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10839 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.32065/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10840 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.32066/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10843 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.32059/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10844 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.30714/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10845 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.23491/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10846 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.22229/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10847 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.31571/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10848 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.27290/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10849 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.29681/2015

CIVIL APPEAL NO.10850 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) NO.12343/2015

J U D G M E N T

AMITAVA ROY, J.

Heard Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, learned counsel for the appellants and Mr. R. Balasubramaniam, Mr. Vishnu B. Saharya, Ms.

Rachna Srivastava, Ms. Shashi Kiran, Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Mr.

Govind Goel and Ms. Garima Prashad, learned counsel for the

2

respondents.

(A) C.A. No. 10838 of 2016 @ SLP (C) No.32064 of 2015, C.A.

No. 10839 of 2016 @ SLP (C) No.32065 of 2015, C.A. No.

10840 of 2016 @ SLP (C) No.32066 of 2015 and C.A. No.

10843 of 2016 @ SLP (C) No.32059 of 2015

(2) It is submitted at the Bar, that the verdict rendered by this Court in Civil Appeal No.1726 of 2015 (dated 18.03.2015) â- Suresh Prasad

@ Hari Kishan & Ors. Vs. Union of India & Anr. , deciding the same

along with a batch of appeals would adequately answer the issues

raised herein, as the all relevant facets i.e. location of the land in

village Masoodabad, notifications for acquisition under the Land

Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, the 'Act') as well as the quantification

of the compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer,

Reference Court and the High Court are same. In this view of the

matter further dilution of individual facts is considered inessential.

(3) On a consideration of the explanation offered, the delay involved

in preferring the appeals, in the singular facts and circumstances, is

hereby condoned. The amount of compensation as granted by this

Court in Suresh Prasad (supra) is also awarded to the appellants i.e.

Rs.24 lacs per acre. Needless to say, the appellants would be entitled

to all statutory benefits under the Act including interest as payable in

terms of the above decision.

3

(B) C.A. No. 10831 of 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22231/2015,

C.A. NO.10832 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22232/2015,

C.A. NO.10833 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22233/2015,

C.A. NO.10834 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22238/2015,

C.A. NO.10835 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22239/2015,

C.A. NO.10836 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.30715/2015,

C.A. NO.10844 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.30714/2015,

C.A. NO.10845 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.23491/2015,

C.A. NO.10846 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.22229/2015 and

C.A. NO.10847 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.31571/2015.

(4) It is submitted at the Bar that the ruling by this Court in Civi

1

Appeal Nos.10982-11033 of 2014 (dated 11.12.2014) â- Charan Singh & Ors. Etc. Vs. Union of India & Anr. , deciding the same along with a batch of appeals would adequately address the issues raised herein, as the all relevant facets i.e. location of the land in village Bamnoli, notifications for acquisition under the Act as well as the quantification of the compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer, Reference Court and the High Court are same. In this view of the matter further dilation of individual facts is considered inessential. (5) On a consideration of the explanation offered, the delay involved in preferring the appeals, in the singular facts and circumstances, is hereby condoned. The amount of compensation as granted by this Court in Charan Singh (supra) is also awarded to the appellants i.e. Rs.25 lacs per acre for land in Block 'A' and Rs.22 lacs per acre for land in Block 'B'. Needless to say, the appellants would be entitled all

4

statutory benefits under the Act including interest as payable in terms of the above decision.

(C) C.A. NO.10848 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.27290/2015, C.A. NO.10849 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.29681/2015 and C.A. NO.10850 OF 2016 @ SLP(C) No.12343/2015.

(6) It is submitted at the Bar that the decision rendered by this Court in Civil Appeal No. 2091 of 2014 (dated 13.02.2014) â- Impulse India Pvt. Ltd. Vs. Union of India & Anr. , deciding the same along with a batch of other appeals would adequately cover the issues raised herein, as the all relevant facets i.e. location of the land in village Bijwasan, Pochanpur and Bharthal, notifications for acquisition under the Act as well as the quantification of the compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition Officer, Reference Court and the High Court are same. In this view of the matter further dilation of individual facts is considered inessential.

(7) On a consideration of the explanation offered, the delay involved in preferring the appeals, in the singular facts and circumstances, is hereby condoned. The amount of compensation as granted by this Court in Impulse India Pvt. Ltd. (supra) is also awarded to the appellants i.e. Rs.21 lacs per acre for land in Block 'A' and Rs.19 lacs per acre for land in Block 'B'. Needless to say, the appellants would be

5

entitled all statutory benefits under the Act including interest as payable in terms of the above decision.

(8) The appeals had been analogously heard and have thus been disposed of in the above terms. Costs easy.

.....J.
(DIPAK MISRA)

â- |.....J.
(AMITAVA ROY)

NEW DELHI;
NOVEMBER 29, 2016.

6

ITEM NO.1A COURT NO.3 SECTION XIV
(For Judgment)

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No.10831/2016

ASHOK KUMAR & ORS Appellant(s)

VERSUS

UNION OF INDIA & ANR Respondent(s)

WITH C.A. No.10832/2016

C.A. No.10833/2016

C.A. No.10834/2016

C.A. No.10835/2016

C.A. No.10836/2016

C.A. No.10838/2016
C.A. No.10839/2016
C.A. No.10840/2016
C.A. No.10843/2016
C.A. No.10844/2016
C.A. No.10845/2016
C.A. No.10846/2016
C.A. No.10847/2016
C.A. No.10848/2016
C.A. No.10849/2016
C.A. No.10850/2016

Date : 29/11/2016 These appeals were called on for pronouncement of Judgment today.

For Appellant(s) Mr. Arvind Kr. Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Dev Prakash Bhardwaj, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ashwani Kumar, AOR
Mr. Rahul Bhatia, Adv.
Ms. Rachana Srivastava, AOR
Mr. Vishnu B. Saharya, Adv.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amitava Roy pronounced the judgment of the Bench comprising Hon'ble Mr. Justice Dipak Misra and His Lordship.

7

The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed reportable judgment.

(Chetan Kumar)

Court Master (H.S. Parasher)

Court Master

(Signed reportable judgment is placed on the file)