

KARAN SINGH AND ORS.

A

v.

UNION OF INDIA

AUGUST 7, 1996

[K. RAMASWAMY AND G.B. PATTANAIK, JJ.]

B

*Land Acquisition Act, 1894 :*

*S.23(1)—Acquisition of land—Compensation—Determination of—Reference court relying upon the judgment of High Court, awarded compensation @ Rs. 10 per sq. yd.—High Court relied upon a single sale deed in similar case in which market value had been fixed at Rs.12 per sq. yd.—Land-owner filed appeal claiming the said rate—High Court declined to interfere—Appeal to this court—Held in view of the legal position that at least one-third of the market value has to be deduced towards development charges, the appellant would get less than what has been granted to him—Since the State has not filed appeal, it is not a case warranting interference.*

C

D

*S.54—Appeal in any proceedings under the Act would lie to High Court against the award and decree of the reference court and further appeal to the Supreme Court would be under Article 136 of the Constitution—The present appeal cannot be treated as one under s.54.*

E

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION : Civil Appeal No. 423 of 1985.

From the Judgment and Order dated 23.7.84 of the Delhi High Court in R.F.A. No. 48 of 1978.

F

Prem Prasad Juneja for the Appellants.

V.C. Mahajan and C.V.S. Rao for the Respondents.

The following Order of the Court was delivered :

G

This appeal arises from the Judgment dated July 23, 1984 of the Division Bench of the Delhi High Court made in R.F.A. No. 281 of 1979.

Notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short, the "Act") acquiring a large extent of land was published on

H

- A March 8, 1957. The land of the appellant admeasuring one bigha and 14 biswas formed part of that land. Reference Court relying upon judgment of the High Court in *A.N. Bhandari v. Union of India*, LPA No. 81 of (1979) decided on May 1, 1990 awarded compensation @ Rs. 10 per square yard. On appeal, it was confirmed. The High Court relied upon a single sale deed in similar case in which market value had been fixed @ Rs. 12 per square yard. Therefore, the appellant also claimed that rate. Since he was not awarded the rate claimed by him, he has filed appeal in this Court challenging the impugned judgment of the High Court.
- B

- C Shri Juneja, learned counsel for the appellant contended that the High Court, having found that the market value of the land in question could fetch was Rs. 12 per square yard, would have granted compensation at that rate. Though *prima facie* we find the contention plausible and acceptable, in view of the legal position that at least 1/3rd of the market value has to be deduced towards development charges and that the said consideration was not adopted in the case on which reliance is placed, the fact boils down that if the award is to be interfered with, the appellant would get less than what has been granted to him by the High Court. However, since the State has not filed any appeal and in the facts and circumstances of the case, we are of the view that it is not a case warranting interference.
- D

- E The appeal under Section 54 of the Act would not lie to this Court. A reading of Section 54 would clearly indicate that the appeal shall lie in any proceedings under the act only to the High Court against the award and decree of the reference Court and further appeal to this Court would be under Article 136 of the Constitution read with Section 11, CPC. by way of special leave and not under section 54 of the Act.
- F

- G Accordingly, this appeal cannot be treated to be an appeal under Section 54 of the Act but one by special leave under Article 136. In either case, we do not find any ground warranting interference. Hence the appeal is dismissed. No costs.

R.P.

Appeal dismissed.