

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

A

v.

ASHA PRAKASH

(Civil Appeal No. 364 of 2023)

JANUARY 20, 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) – Writ petition was preferred by original writ petitioner-subsequent purchaser – High Court relying upon Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. vs Harakchand Misrimal Solanki & Ors allowed the writ petition preferred by the respondent/original writ petitioners and held that the acquisition proceedings in respect of land in question is deemed to have lapsed u/s.24(2) of 2013 Act as compensation was not paid to the original landowners – On appeal, held : The subsequent purchaser has no locus to challenge the acquisition/lapse of acquisition – Thus, High Court committed an error in entertaining the writ petition preferred by the respondent no.1 – Also, applying the law laid by Supreme Court in Indore Development Authority, which has overruled the decision in Pune Municipal Corporation, to the facts of the instant case – Impugned judgment and order of the High Court unsustainable – Appeal allowed.

C

D

E

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

Government (NCT of Delhi) vs. Manav Dharam Trust and Anr., (2017) 6 SCC 751– held not good law.

F

Pune Municipal Corporation & Anr. vs. Harakchand Misrimal Solanki & ors (2014) 3 SCC 183 : [2014] 1 SCR 783; Shiv Kumar and Anr. vs. Union of India and Ors., (2019) 10 SCC 229; Delhi Development Authority vs. Godfrey Philips (I) Ltd. & Ors., (Civil Appeal No. 3073 of 2022 decided by the Supreme Court); Delhi Administration Thr. Secretary, Land and Building Department & Ors. vs. Pawan Kumar & Ors., (Civil Appeal No. 3646 of 2022 decided by the Supreme Court) – referred to.

G

H

A

Case Law Reference

[2020] 3 SCR 1	followed	Para 4, 5
[2014] 1 SCR 783	referred to	Para 2, 4
[2017] 4 SCR 232	referred to	Para 2,3

B

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No.364 of 2023.

From the Judgment and Order dated 04.01.2018 of the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi in WP (C) No.9545 of 2015.

C

Atul Kumar, Ms. Sweety Singh, Ms. Archana Kumari, Rahul Pandey, Avs Kadyan, Rajiv Ranjan, Mishra Saurabh, Ms. Sujeeta Srivastava, Nishit Agrawal, Ms. Kanishka Mittal, Ms. Vanya Agrawal, Ashwani Kumar, Anshay Dhatwalia, Ms. Binu Tamta, Ms. Smita Maan, Nitin Mishra, Ishaan Sharma, Mohit Kumar Gupta, Shekhar Yadav, Ms. Iti Sharma, Rahul Bhatia, Rachita Kadyan, N. S. Vashist, Gagan Gupta,

D

Ms. Astha Tyagi, Dinesh Chander Trehan, Ms. Diksha Narula, Advs. for the appearing parties.

The Judgment of the Court was delivered by

M. R. SHAH, J.

E

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. 9545 of 2015 by which the High Court has allowed the said writ petition and has declared that the acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as “Act, 1894”) with regard to the land in question is deemed to have lapsed

F

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 (DDA) has preferred the present appeal.

G

2. Having heard the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respective parties and on going through the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court, it appears that a specific plea was raised before the High Court on the maintainability of the writ petition by the original writ petitioner as he was the subsequent purchaser. However, relying upon the decision of this Court in the case of **Government (NCT of Delhi) Vs. Manav Dharam Trust and Anr.,**

H

(2017) 6 SCC 751, the High Court has overruled the said objection and thereafter has entertained the writ petition preferred by the respondent No. 1 herein – original writ petitioner – subsequent purchaser and thereafter after following the 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 allowed the said writ petition and has declared that the acquisition with respect to the land in question is deemed to have lapsed as compensation has not been paid to the original landowners. A
B

3. The decision of this Court in the case of **Manav Dharam Trust and Anr. (supra)**, which has been relied upon by the High Court while passing the impugned judgment and order and overruling the objection raised on behalf of the appellant on the maintainability of the writ petition at the instance of the respondent No. 1 – original writ petitioner is held to be not a good law in view of the subsequent decision of this Court in the case of **Shiv Kumar and Anr. Vs. Union of India and Ors., (2019) 10 SCC 229** and thereafter in the subsequent decisions in the case of **Delhi Development Authority Vs. Godfrey Philips (I) Ltd. & Ors., - Civil Appeal No. 3073 of 2022** and **Delhi Administration Thr. Secretary, Land and Building Department & Ors. Vs. Pawan Kumar & Ors., - Civil Appeal No. 3646 of 2022**. In the aforesaid decisions, it is specifically observed and held by this Court that the subsequent purchaser has no locus to challenge the acquisition / lapse of acquisition. C
D
E

4. Under the circumstances, the High Court has committed a grave error in entertaining the writ petition preferred by the respondent No. 1 herein, who is a subsequent purchaser praying for deemed lapse of acquisition. Even otherwise, the decision of this Court in the case of **Pune Municipal Corporation and Anr. (supra)** relied upon by the High Court while passing the impugned judgment and order has been specifically overruled by the Constitution Bench of this Court in the case of **Indore Development Authority Vs. Manoharlal and Ors., (2020) 8 SCC 129**. In paragraphs 365 and 366, the Constitution Bench of this Court has observed and held as under:- F
G

“365. Resultantly, the decision rendered in Pune Municipal Corpn. [Pune Municipal Corpn. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 SCC 183] is hereby overruled and all other decisions in which Pune Municipal Corpn. [Pune H

- A Municipal Corpn. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 SCC 183] has been followed, are also overruled. The decision in Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Assn. [Sree Balaji Nagar Residential Assn. v. State of T.N., (2015) 3 SCC 353] cannot be said to be laying down good law, is overruled and other
- B decisions following the same are also overruled. In Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra [(2018) 3 SCC 412], the aspect with respect to the proviso to Section 24(2) and whether “or” has to be read as “nor” or as “and” was not placed for consideration. Therefore, that decision too cannot prevail, in the light of the discussion in the present judgment.
- C **366.** In view of the aforesaid discussion, we answer the questions as under:
- D **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.
- E **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.
- F **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.
- G **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
- H 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 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.

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 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).

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).

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

A of interim orders passed by court has to be excluded in the computation of five years.

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

C 5. Applying the law laid down by this Court in the aforesaid three decisions on the locus of the respondent No. 1 – subsequent purchaser to file the writ petition / challenge the acquisition / lapse of acquisition and the decision of this Court in the case of **Indore Development Authority (supra)** to the facts of the case on hand, the impugned judgment and order passed by the High Court is unsustainable and the same deserves to be quashed and set aside and is accordingly quashed and set aside,

Present appeal is accordingly allowed. No costs.

Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.