

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

A

v.

RAJENDER SINGH & ORS.

(Civil Appeal No.1301 of 2023)

FEBRUARY 24, 2023

B

[M. R. SHAH AND C. T. RAVIKUMAR, JJ.]

Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 – S. 24(2) – Specific case on behalf of the DDA that possession of the lands in question were taken over and the compensation with respect to the said lands was sent in RD due to dispute – High Court relying upon the decision in the case of Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr. vs. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Ors., declared that the acquisition with respect to the lands in question is deemed to have lapsed u/s. 24(2) of the Act, 2013 solely on the ground that the compensation was not paid in the manner known to law to the land owners – Held: The decision in Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki & ors. has been specifically overruled by the Constitution Bench in the case Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal and Ors. – As per the law laid down by Supreme Court in the case of Indore Development Authority for deemed lapse under Section 24(2) of the Act, 2013, twin conditions, namely, (i) the possession is not taken and (ii) the compensation is not tendered/paid are to be satisfied and if one of the conditions is not satisfied there shall not be any lapse or deemed lapse under the Act, 2013 – Therefore, the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court unsustainable and accordingly, set aside – Appeal allowed.

C

D

E

F

Indore Development Authority vs Manoharlal & Ors.
(2020) 8 SCC 129 : [2020] 3 SCR 1 – followed.

Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. vs. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki & ors **(2014) 3 SCC 183 : [2014] 1 SCR 783 – referred to.**

G

Case Law Reference

[2020] 3 SCR 1

followed

Para 3.1

H

A [2014] 1 SCR 783 referred to Para 3

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No.1301 of 2023.

From the Judgment and Order dated 01.08.2017 of the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in WP (C) No.3561 of 2015.

B

Ms. Manika Tripathy, Ashutosh Kaushik, Manish Vashist, Advs. for the Appellant.

Ms. A. Sahitya Veena, Ms. Supriya Juneja, Viksit Arora, Advs. for the Respondents.

C

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

M. R. SHAH, J.

D 1. Feeling aggrieved and dissatisfied with the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in Writ Petition (C) No. 3561 of 2015, by which, the High Court has allowed the said writ petition and has declared that the acquisition with respect to the land in question is deemed to have lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as “Act, 2013”), the Delhi Development Authority has preferred the present
E appeal.

F 2. Having heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and having gone through the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court and even the counter affidavit filed before the High Court by the Delhi Development Authority wherein it was the specific case on behalf of the respondent therein that the possession of lands in question was taken over and handed over to the beneficiary department on 23.09.1981 and the compensation with respect to the said lands was sent in RD due to dispute.

G 3. However, thereafter despite the above and relying upon the earlier decision of this Court in the case of **Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr. Vs. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki and Ors., (2014) 3 SCC 183**, the High Court has declared that the acquisition with respect to the lands in question is deemed to have lapsed under Section 24(2) of the Act, 2013 solely on the ground that the compensation was not paid in the manner known to law to the land owners.

H

3.1 The view taken by the High Court is just contrary to the law laid down by this Court in the case of **Indore Development Authority Vs. Manoharlal and Ors., (2020) 8 SCC 129**. In paragraph 366, the Constitution Bench of this Court has observed and held as under:- A

“366. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we answer the questions as under: B

366.1. Under the provisions of Section 24(1)(a) in case the award is not made as on 1-1-2014, the date of commencement of the 2013 Act, there is no lapse of proceedings. Compensation has to be determined under the provisions of the 2013 Act.

366.2. In case the award has been passed within the window period of five years excluding the period covered by an interim order of the court, then proceedings shall continue as provided under Section 24(1)(b) of the 2013 Act under the 1894 Act as if it has not been repealed. C

366.3. The word “or” used in Section 24(2) between possession and compensation has to be read as “nor” or as “and”. The deemed lapse of land acquisition proceedings under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act takes place where due to inaction of authorities for five years or more prior to commencement of the said Act, the possession of land has not been taken nor compensation has been paid. In other words, in case possession has been taken, compensation has not been paid then there is no lapse. Similarly, if compensation has been paid, possession has not been taken then there is no lapse. D E

366.4. The expression “paid” in the main part of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act does not include a deposit of compensation in court. The consequence of non-deposit is provided in the proviso to Section 24(2) in case it has not been deposited with respect to majority of landholdings then all beneficiaries (landowners) as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the 1894 Act shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act. In case the obligation under Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 has not been fulfilled, interest under Section 34 of the said Act can be granted. Non-deposit of compensation (in court) does not result in the lapse of land acquisition proceedings. In case of non-deposit with respect to F G H

A the majority of holdings for five years or more, compensation under the 2013 Act has to be paid to the “landowners” as on the date of notification for land acquisition under Section 4 of the 1894 Act.

B **366.5.** In case a person has been tendered the compensation as provided under Section 31(1) of the 1894 Act, it is not open to him to claim that acquisition has lapsed under Section 24(2) due to non-payment or non-deposit of compensation in court. The obligation to pay is complete by tendering the amount under Section 31(1). The landowners who had refused to accept compensation or who sought reference for higher compensation, cannot claim that the acquisition proceedings had lapsed under C Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act.

366.6. The proviso to Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act is to be treated as part of Section 24(2), not part of Section 24(1)(b).

D **366.7.** The mode of taking possession under the 1894 Act and as contemplated under Section 24(2) is by drawing of inquest report/memorandum. Once award has been passed on taking possession under Section 16 of the 1894 Act, the land vests in State there is no divesting provided under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, as once possession has been taken there is no lapse under Section 24(2).

E **366.8.** The provisions of Section 24(2) providing for a deemed lapse of proceedings are applicable in case authorities have failed due to their inaction to take possession and pay compensation for five years or more before the 2013 Act came into force, in a proceeding for land acquisition pending with the authority concerned as on 1-1-2014. The period of subsistence of F interim orders passed by court has to be excluded in the computation of five years.

G **366.9.** Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act does not give rise to new cause of action to question the legality of concluded proceedings of land acquisition. Section 24 applies to a proceeding pending on the date of enforcement of the 2013 Act i.e. 1-1-2014. It does not revive stale and time-barred claims and does not reopen concluded proceedings nor allow landowners to question the legality of mode of taking possession to reopen proceedings or H

mode of deposit of compensation in the treasury instead of court A
to invalidate acquisition.”

4. Thus, as per the law laid down by this Court in the case of
Indore Development Authority (supra) for deemed lapse under B
Section 24(2) of the Act, 2013, twin conditions, namely, (i) the possession
is not taken and (ii) the compensation is not tendered/paid are to be
satisfied and if one of the conditions is not satisfied there shall not be any
lapse or deemed lapse under the Act, 2013.

5. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the case of **Indore**
Development Authority (supra), the impugned judgment and order C
passed by the High Court is unsustainable and the same deserves to be
quashed and set aside and is accordingly quashed and set aside. There
shall be no deemed lapse of the acquisition with respect to the lands in
question.

Present appeal is accordingly allowed. No costs. Pending D
applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

Ankit Gyan
(Assisted by : Abhishek Agnihotri, LCRA)

Appeal allowed.