[2025] 3 S.C.R. 1460 : 2025 INSC 407

State of Haryana & Others
v.
Aalamgir & Others

(Civil Appeal No. 4052 of 2025)

18 March 2025

[B.V. Nagarathna and Satish Chandra Sharma, JJ.]

Issue for Consideration

The present appeals assail the orders passed by the Punjab and Haryana High Court in several writ petitions in respect of acquisition of various parcels of land from time to time by issuance of notifications u/ss.4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

Headnotes†

Land Acquisition Act, 1894 – ss.4 and 6 – Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 – s.24(2) – The respondents land owners/subsequent purchasers have assailed the acquisition process – The validity of the acquisition were raised in the various writ petitions filed by them – However, pursuant to the enforcement of 2013 Act, fresh writ petitions were filed seeking relief under sub-section (2) of s.24 of the 2013 Act – In some of the impugned judgments, the High Court has followed the earlier judgment of this Court in Pune Municipal Corporation and has granted relief to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers – Correctness:

Held: 1. In the instant case, if these appeals have to be considered on merits then the judgment passed by the five-Judge Bench of this Court in the case of Indore Development Authority would have to be applied to the facts of each case – In the circumstances, this Court finds it just and proper to set aside the impugned orders and remand these matters to the High Court for reconsideration of the Writ Petitions filed by the respondents land owners/subsequent purchasers and to dispose of those Writ Petitions on the basis of the recent judgment of this Court in Indore Development Authority by applying the ratio and the observations of the said judgment to the facts of each case as they emanate in each of the cases. [Paras 7, 9]

2. Since this Court is remanding the matters to the High Court, the order of *status quo* which were prevailing in those cases may be continued till the disposal of the writ petitions by the High Court. [Para 11]

3. Further, liberty reserved to the respondents-land owners/ subsequent purchasers to raise all available contentions with regard to the validity of the acquisition which have been undertaken under the LA Act of 1894 before the High Court. [Para 14]

4. Considering the long lapse of time between the quashing of the acquisition or a declaration that they have lapsed and the matters now being remanded to the High court for reconsideration and there being subsequent developments with regard to the subject land in question, liberty may be reserved to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers to raise all contentions on the basis of equity and in accordance with law. [Para 16]

5. In certain cases there may be death of the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers and there has been no application filed for substitution of the deceased before this Court – The High Court directed to issue fresh notices to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers if they have not appeared before the High Court in those cases. [Para 17]

6. If the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers wish to take advantage of the concessions or the consent orders made by the High Court on the basis of the concessions made by the State, the same shall be considered having regard to the respective contentions advanced at the Bar and in accordance with law. [Para 19]

Case Law Cited

Indore Development Authority v. Manoharlal **[2020] 3 SCR 1 : (2020) 8 SCC 129 – followed.**

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

List of Acts

Land Acquisition Act, 1894; Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013.

List of Keywords

Land acquisition; Acquisition process; Validity of the acquisition; Section 24 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013; Land owners; Subsequent purchasers; Order of *status quo*; Subsequent development in respect of land acquired; Death of land owners; Fresh Notices; Remanding of matters to High Court; Advantage of the concessions; Consent orders; Indore Development Authority case.

Case Arising From

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION: Civil Appeal No. 4052 of 2025

From the Judgment and Order dated 30.11.2017 of the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh in CWP No. 5105 of 2017

With

Civil Appeal No(s). 401-403 and 2220 of 2024, Civil Appeal No(s). 4053, 4054, 4055, 4056, 4057, 4058, 4059, 4060, 4061, 4062, 4063, 4064, 4065-4067, 4068-4069, 4070, 4071, 4072, 4073, 4074-4077, 4078-4079, 4080, 4081, 4082, 4083, 4084, 4085, 4086, 4087, 4088, 4089, 4090, 4091, 4092, 4093, 4094, 4095-4104, 4105, 4106, 4107, 4108, 4109, 4110, 4111, 4112, 4113, 4114, 4115, 4116, 4117-4121, 4122, 4123, 4124, 4125, 4126-4130, 4131, 4132, 4133, 4134, 4135, 4136, 4137, 4138, 4139, 4140, 4141, 4142, 4143, 4144, 4145, 4146, 4147, 4148, 4149, 4150-4153, 4154, 4155, 4156, 4157, 4158, 4159, 4160, 4161, 4162, 4163, 4164-4170, 4171, 4172, 4173, 4174, 4175, 4176, 4177, 4178, 4179, 4180, 4181, 4182, 4183, 4184, 4185, 4186, 4187, 4188, 4189, 4190, 4191, 4192, 4193, 4194, 4195, 4196, 4197, 4198, 4199, 4200, 4201, 4202, 4203, 4204, 4205, 4206, 4208, 4209, 4210, 4211, 4212, 4213, 4214, 4215, 4216, 4217, 4218, 4219, 4220, 4221, 4222, 4223, 4224, 4225, 4226, 4227, 4228, 4229, 4230, 4231, 4232, 4233, 4234, 4235, 4236, 4237-4240, 4241, 4242, 4243, 4244, 4245, 4246, 4247, 4248, 4249, 4250, 4251, 4252, 4253, 4254, 4255, 4256, 4257, 4258, 4259, 4260, 4261, 4262, 4263, 4264, 4265, 4266, 4267, 4268 and 4269 of 2025.

Appearances for Parties

Advs. for the Appellants:
Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General, Lokesh Sinhal, Alok Sangwan, Sr. A.A.G., B.K. Satija, Birendra Kumar Choudhary, A.A.G., Shekhar

Raj Sharma, D.A.G., Dushyant Dave, Sr. Adv., Parveen Kumar, Raj Kishor Choudhary, Shakeel Ahmed, Ms. Pratibha Singh, Vikram Patralekh, Shree Pal Singh, Vishwa Pal Singh, Dr. Nirmal Chopra, Sanjay Kumar Visen, Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, Kanu Agrawal, Bhuvan Kapoor, Varun Chugh, Krishna Kant Dubey, Shubham Bhalla, Akshay Amritanshu, Ms. Drishti Saraf, Ms. Pragya Upadhyay, Nikunj Gupta, Ms. Aakanksha, Gurmeet Singh Makker, Sumit Kumar Sharma, Samar Vijay Singh, Rajat Sangwan, Ms. Nidhi Narwal, Ms. Sabarni Som, Annirudh Sharma, Aman Dev Sharma, Shikhar Narwal, Fateh Singh, Aniruddha Deshmukh.

Advs. for the Respondents:
Gopal Sankaranarayanan, Vangala Eswaraiah, Narender Hooda, Aashish Chopra, Deepak Nargolkar, Ms. Kaadambari Singh, Nidhesh Gupta, Ashish Aggarwal, Rameshwar Singh Malik, Manoj Swarup, Parthiv K. Goswami, Arunabh Chowdhury, Rajive Bhalla, Siddharth Yadav, Gagan Gupta, Manoj Swarup, Rishi Malhotra, S.K. Gangele, U.K. Uniyal, D Sheshadri Naidu, Mahabir Singh, Aakash Dahiya, Maninder Singh, Arunabh Chowdhury, Rajul Bhargava, Ms. Pinaki Misra, Dushyant Dave, Manoj Swarup, Sr. Advs., Sunny Kadiyan, Ms. Mayuri Raghuvanshi, Azmat Hayat Amanullah, Nitin Kaushal, Ms. Rebecca Mishra, Vishal Sinha, Ms. Aditi Gupta, Ms. Meera Kaura, Tejas Patel, Ritika Saini, Puru Pratap Singh, Ms. Manika Pandey, Ms. Zainab Hussain, Mehul Garg, Pawan Aneja, Praveen, Shiv Bhatnagar, Mrs. Pallvi Hooda, Yuvraj Nandal, Ms. Tannu, Dr. Surender Singh Hooda, Ms. Amita Singh Kalkal, Ms. Amita Singh Kalkal, Ms. Aditi Gupta, Rohit Chaudhary, Shreeji Bhavsar, Siddharth Mittal, Abhijeet Varshney, Darshan Sejwal, Deepak Agarwal, Sumit Kumar Sharma, Mrs. Shilpa G Mittal, Ms. Rupa Pathania, Somiran Sharma, Vibhuti Sushant Gupta, Lokesh Baimad, Mattegunta Ramkrishna, Narender Kumar Verma, Shish Pal Laler, Hitesh Kumar, Hardik Giri, Atul, Pranav Singh Gautam, Ms. Kadambini, Ravi Panwar, Abhimanyu Tewari, Ms. Eliza Bar, Sidhant Awasthy, Siddhant Saroha, Soayib Qureshi, Sachin Jain, Rajiv Ranjan Dwivedi, Vishal, Mrs. Subhadra Dwivedi, Aman Raj Gandhi, Rajnish Kumar Jha, Harsh Kinra, Apoorva Kinra, Dinesh Verma, Subhasish Bhowmick, Imran Khan, Inam-ul-haq, Anil K. Chopra, M/s V. Maheshwari & Co., Ronak Karanpuria, S. Senthil Elangovan, S. Krishnamoorthy, K. Kumaravadivel, C Dinakaran, Gurrick Jassar, Pranshu Dahiya, Yogesh Kumar Dahiya, Kripa Shankar Prasad, Sukant Vikram, Ashish Manral, Ms. Muskaan Chawla, Ms. Tanya Singh Kaurav, Mohd. Faisal, M/s Veritas

Legis, Ananga Bhattacharyya, Ms. Devahuti Tamuli, Krishanu Barua, Aabhas Kshetarpal, Dhiliban Varadarajan, Harsh N Dudhe, Siddhartha Jha, Jatinder Kumar Bhatia, Vikrant Narayan Vasudeva, Rohit Lochav, Sarthak Chiller, Kapil Kumar, Somvir Singh Deswal, Abhishek Deswal, Roshneel Singh, Bhupendra Dalal, Manoj Kumar, Kuldeep Singh Bhakar, Nischal Kumar Neeraj, Wills Mathews, Dhanesh M. Nair, Paul John Edison, Ms. Anila Tharakan Thomas, Rakesh Garg, Ashish Gopal Garg, Ms. Shweta Garg, Ms. Japneet Kaur, Madhav Gupta, Bikram Dwivedi, Manu Bhardwaj, G. Balaji, Vedant Singh, Vishisht Singh, Navneet Singh, Sandeep Bhiduri, Ankur Bansal, Sadre Alam, Kumar Gaurav, Davesh Bhatia, Jitesh Malik, Ms. Anisha Dahiya, Jatin Hooda, B.C. Bhatt, N D Kaushik, Satish Kumar, Vikas Verma, Mrs. Sapna Verma, Shafik Ahmed, Anamay Mishra, Aakriti Yunas, Padmanav Choudhury, Bhagwat Dayal, M/s Karanjawala & Co., Jawahar Chawla, Amit Chawla, Ms. Shelly Chawla, Ms. Zehra Khan, Ms. Delphina Shinglai, Siddharth Bambha, Shyam D. Nandan, Ms. Nandna Manon, Pankaj Yadav, Prateek Yadav, Ms. Diksha Rai, Ms. Vanshaja Shukla, Ms. Nina Nariman, Ms. Atiga Singh, Piyush Vyas, Piyush Vyash, Ms. Purvat Wali, Mrs. Purvat Wali, Ms. Apurva Sachdev, Ms. Shalu Sharma, Parveen Kumar, Krishan Kumar, Seemant K. Garg, Nitin Pal, Karan Kapoor, Yajur Bhalla, Manik Kapoor, Ms. Srishti Singla, Shubham Bhalla, Akansha Gulati, Ms. Ragini Sharma, Ms. Gauri Bedi, Alex Noel Dass, Ms. Aadya Kapoor, Divyansh Mishra, Rohit Pandey, Shantwanu Singh, Mrs. Pragya Singh, Akshay Singh, Rahul Dubey, Sunny Singh, B.S. Chadhry, Amit Kumar Chawla, Varun Varma, Ms. Niharika Dewivedi, Ms. Monika, Amitabh Pandey, Ravindra Bana, Siddharth Batra, Chinmay Dubey, Ms. Shivani Chawla, Ms. Archna Yadav, Parth Poonia, Rhythm Katyal, Gaurav Jain, Ms. Abha Jain, Mohit Kumar Daraad, Ms. Manya Kaushik, Satyen Srivastva, Shubham Kashyap, Gurmehar Vaan Singh, Daya Krishan Sharma, Rohit Vats, Yashdeep, Ankit Bhanot, Amir Yadav, Vineet Kumar Yadav, Mayank Aggarwal, Sanjeev Kumar Aggarwal, Saurabh Gupta, Ananta Prasad Mishra, Ankit Swarup, Neelmani Pant, Hamd Tariq, Hamad Tariq, Yash Singhal, M/s Delhi Law Chambers, Rajiv Kataria, Ms. Debjani Das Purkayastha, Mrs. Sunita Punia, Prem Malhotra, Ms. Ansuiya, Shivaansh Maini, Ms. Divya Jyoti Singh, Ms. Vanshaja Shukla, Parmanand Yadav, Ms. Ankeeta Appanna, Ritesh Agrawal, Sunder Khatri, Ms. Priyanshi Sharma, Dhiraj Abraham Philip, Balraj Rathee, Febin Mathew Varghese, Naveen Richard, Ms. Achalika Ahuja, Ms. Priya Sharma, Kailash Chand Mudgal, Nandlal Kumar

Mishra, Pawan Kumar, Ms. Nitipriya Kar, Tanuj Dixit, Dr. Sushil Balwada, Abhishek Garg, D.K. Garg, Dhananjay Garg, Gaurav Saini, Ms. Anubha Agrawal, Himanshu Jain, Somanatha Padhan, A.V.S. Raju, Akash Kakade, M/s. Krishna & Nishani Law Chambers, Anil C Nishani, Mrs. Divya Narayan, Krishna M. Singh, Vishwesh R. Murnal, Bharat Bhushan, Keshav Bansal, Karan Kapoor, Manik Kapoor, Ms. Srishti Singla, Shrey Kapoor, Rahul Narang, Jawahar Narang, Shreay Saini, Somesh Chandra Jha, Rakesh Dahiya, Praveen Kumar, Dr. Sukhdev Sharma, Karan Kapoor, O.P.Sehrawat, Manik Kapoor, Rameshwar Prasad Goyal, Mukesh Sharma, Raghav Awasthi, Dinesh Sharma, Rakesh Kumar Yadav, Dr. B.R.Saini, Mrs. Revathy Raghavan, Ketan Paul, Shish Pal Laler, Hitesh Kumar, Atul, Hardik Giri, Pranav Singh Gautam, Ms. Kadambini, Varun Tokas, R. C. Kaushik, Chandra Bhushan Prasad, Jatin Vats, Naveen Kumar, Dr. Nirmal Chopra, Pardeep Dahiya, Deepak Goel, Ms. Mahima Benipuri, Aditya Goyal, Mrs. Archana Preeti Gupta, Aman Jha, Rishi Tutu, Raman Yadav, Kshitij Mayank, Vikram Nagpal, R. C. Kohli, Ayush Shekhawat, Sanchar Anand, Devendra Singh, Shiv Kumar, Aman Kumar Thakur, Abhishek Bhardwaj, Jasbir Singh Malik, Ms. Niharika Singh, Ms. Rhythm Bharadwaj, Ms. Suman Sharma, Varun Punia, Vikas Mehta, Ankit Vashisht, Divyanshu Kumar Srivastava, Abhinay, Ms. Parul Khurana, Aditya Singh, Shubham Singh, Kamal Kishor, Vaseem, Ankur Chawla, Rahul Pratap, Karan Gogna, Karan Kumar Gogna, Akshay Sahani, Akshay Sahni, Aditya Soni, Ranbir Singh Yadav, Prateek Yadav, Puran Mal Saini, Ms. Anzu K. Varkey, Gurmeet Singh Makker, Rajesh P., Jinendra Jain, D. Kumanan, Atul Kumar, Abhimanyu Sharma, Ms. Deepali, Amit Gupta, Rahul Thukral, Tarun Gupta, Shiv Charan Garg, Imran Khan, Parminder Singh Bhullar, Chritarth Palli, Praveen Bahadur, Ms. Ruby Singh Ahuja, Ms. Akanksha Thapa, Ms. Kritika Sachdeva, Jappanpreet, Uzma Sheikh, Saurabh, M/s Karanjawala & Co., Ms. Shraddha Deshmukh, Utkarsh Kokcha, Sanchit Singh, Ashutosh Ghade, Ms. Sneha Balapure, Shiv Charan Garg, Imran Khan, Ms. Jahanvi Garg, Sumit Kansal, Vikas Verma, Mrs. Sapna Verma, Shafik Ahmed, Ms. Sapna Verma, Anamay Mishra, Ms. Aakriti Yunas, Aakriti Yunas, Padmanav Choudhury, Bhagwat Dayal, Bharat Bhushan, Keshav Bansal, Sabarish Subramanian.

Petitioner-in-person.

Respondent-in-person.

Caveator-in-person.

Judgment / Order of the Supreme Court

Order

Applications seeking condonation of delay in filing applications for setting-aside abatement in the case of deceased respondents/parties are allowed. Abatement is set-aside. Consequently, the applications seeking substitution of the legal representatives of the deceased respondents/parties are allowed.

1.1 Amended memos of parties shall be filed either by the learned counsel for the appellant-State or by the learned counsel who are appearing for the respondents.

1.2 The applications for condonation of delay in filing the Special Leave Petitions have been filed by the State of Haryana and other parties.

1.3 Learned counsel for the State submitted that in certain cases, delay in filing the Special Leave Petitions has been condoned subject to payment of costs in the range of Rs.10,000/- etc. In certain other cases, the delay has been condoned without imposition of any costs as such.

1.4 In some of these cases, the applications have been allowed and the delay has been condoned subject to payment of costs in certain cases. The details of the said cases are given in a tabular form as under:

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No.	Delay in Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)
01	28	SLP(C) No.32689/2018	257
02	28.3	SLP(C) No.16448/2018	156
03	28.4	SLP(C) No.22215/2018	176
04	28.5	SLP(C) No.16462/2018	156
05	28.7	SLP(C) No.26841/2018	189
06	28.11	SLP(C) No.22213/2018	218
07	28.12	SLP(C) No.22221/2018	213

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No.	Delay in Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)
08	28.14	SLP(C) Nos.22216-22217/2018	198
09	28.17	SLP(C) No.16454/2018	220
10	28.18	SLP(C) No.16440/2018	204
11	28.19	SLP(C) Nos.16294-16297/2024	214
12	28.20	SLP(C) Nos.22218-22219/2018	233
13	28.21	SLP(C) No.16281/2024	237
14	28.22	SLP(C) No.16284/2024	237
15	28.23	SLP(C) No.16283/2024	237
16	28.24	SLP(C) No.16293/2024	286
17	28.25	SLP(C) No.16282/2024	224
18	28.26	SLP(C) No.16321/2024	145
19	28.27	SLP(C) No.16291/2024	248
20	28.28	SLP(C) No.16288/2024	248
21	28.30	SLP(C) No.16316/2024	252
22	28.31	SLP(C) No.26842/2018	252
23	28.32	SLP(C) No.16315/2024	254
24	28.34	SLP(C) No.16313/2024	254
25	28.35	SLP(C) No.16314/2024	254
26	28.36	SLP(C) Nos.16303-16312/2024	269
27	28.37	SLP(C) No.16275/2024	273
28	28.38	SLP(C) No.16280/2024	267
29	28.39	SLP(C) No.16298/2024	267
30	28.40	SLP(C) No.16456/2018	267
31	28.41	SLP(C) No.16279/2024	267
32	28.42	SLP(C) No.16277/2024	267

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No.	Delay in Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)
33	28.43	SLP(C) No.16437/2018	267
34	28.44	SLP(C) No.16276/2024	267
35	28.45	SLP(C) No.16302/2024	267
36	28.46	SLP(C) No.16292/2024	245
37	28.47	SLP(C) No.16301/2024	245
38	28.48	SLP(C) No.16299/2024	245
39	28.49	SLP(C) Nos.16266-16270/2024	246
40	28.50	SLP(C) No.16445/2018	284
41	28.53	SLP(C) No.26833/2024	276
42	28.54	SLP(C) Nos.26835-26839/2024	281
43	28.61	SLP(C) No.16435/2018	459
44	28.62	SLP(C) No.16453/2018	440
45	28.63	SLP(C) No.16464/2018	406
46	28.64	SLP(C) No.16442/2018	489
47	28.65	SLP(C) No.16443/2018	406
48	28.66	SLP(C) No. 16449/2018	406
49	28.67	SLP(C) No. 16436/2018	407
50	28.68	SLP(C) No. 16441/2018	398
51	28.69	SLP(C) No. 16459/2018	492
52	28.70	SLP(C) No. 16451/2018	462
53	28.71	SLP(C) No. 19843/2018	465
54	28.77	SLP(C) No. 9787/2019	390
55	28.78	SLP(C) No. 9788/2019	341
56	28.79	SLP(C) No. 9789/2019	341
57	28.80	SLP(C) No. 5437/2020	848
58	28.81	SLP(C) No. 29106/2019	949

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No.	Delay in Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)
59	28.83	SLP(C) No. 5550/2018	112
60	28.84	SLP(C) No. 24250/2018	195
61	28.85	SLP(C) No. 26833-26839/2018	188
62	28.86	SLP(C) No. 7997/2019	110
63	28.87	SLP(C) No. 7999/2019	114
64	28.88	SLP(C) No. 31944/2018	556
65	28.89	SLP(C) No. 31946/2018	559
66	28.90	SLP(C) No. 8003/2019	715
67	28.92	SLP(C) No. 10236/2019	390
68	28.93	SLP(C) No. 9790/2019	341
69	28.94	SLP(C) No. 9791/2019	341
70	28.95	SLP(C) No. 10228/2019	390
71	28.96	SLP(C) No. 14950/2019	404
72	28.97	SLP(C) No. 10808/2019	337
73	28.98	SLP(C) No. 16733/2024	349
74	28.122	SLP(C) No. 24835/2019	447
75	28.125	SLP(C) No. 2454/2020	526
76	28.126	SLP(C) No. 2554/2020	527
77	28.127	SLP(C) No. 29104/2019	588
78	28.128	SLP(C) No. 29107/2019	582
79	28.129	SLP(C) No. 29108/2019	946
80	28.133	SLP(C) No. 30217/2019	596
81	28.134	SLP(C) No. 30218/2019	556
82	28.136	SLP(C) No. 6582/2020	692
83	28.157	C.A. No. 401-403/2024	188
84	28.158	SLP(C) No. 19325-19328/2019	211, 225, 226

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No.	Delay in Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)
85	28.159	SLP(C) No. 21895/2018	249
86	28.161	SLP(C) No. 10198/2019	26
87	28.162	SLP(C) No. 7993/2019	111
88	28.163	C.A. No. 2220/2024	494
89	28.164	SLP(C) No. 32691/2018	257
90	28.165	SLP(C) No. 1541/2019	281
91	28.166	SLP(C) No. 4232/2019	617
92	28.167	SLP(C) No. 2991/2019	316
93	28.168	SLP(C) No. 4228/2019	316
94	28.169	SLP(C) No. 5257/2019	360
95	28.171	SLP(C) No. 8002/2019	715
96	28.173	SLP(C) No. 9556/2019	390
97	28.174	SLP(C) No. 10227/2019	390
98	28.175	SLP(C) No. 9786/2019	341
99	28.176	SLP(C) No. 10231/2019	408
100	28.177	SLP(C) No. 10807/2019	322
101	28.178	SLP(C) No. 10993/2019	333
102	28.179	SLP(C) No. 11859/2019	333
103	28.182	SLP(C) No. 14271/2020	519
104	28.184	SLP(C) No. 28204/2019	513
105	28.185	SLP(C) No. 6563/2020	772

1.5 The extent of delay in all these above cases is also noted by us. In the following cases there is no delay in filing the Special Leave Petitions:

Sr. No.	Item No.	Item No.
1.	28.1	SLP(C) No.9553/2017
2.	28.2	SLP(C) No.9553/2017

1.6 Having regard to the nature of the order which we propose to pass in these cases, we condone the delay in those Special Leave Petitions where applications are pending for condonation of delay. Consequently, in these cases where delay has not yet been condoned, the applications are allowed and the delay in filing the Special Leave Petitions is condoned, subject to payment of costs which is determined as follows:

S. No.	Delay in Filing the SLPs	Costs Imposed per SLP (In Rs.)
01.	Upto 200 Days	Rs.5,000/-
02.	201 – 500 Days	Rs.10,000/-
03.	501 – 1000 Days	Rs.20,000/-
04.	1001 – 1500 Days	Rs.30,000/-
05.	1501 - 2500 Days	Rs.40,000/-
06.	2501 - 3000 Days	Rs.50,000/-

1.7 In view of the above determination, the costs are ordered to be imposed in the following matters where delay has not been condoned:

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No(s).	Delay In Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)	Costs Imposed per SLP
01	28.6	Diary No.28518 of 2017	190	Rs.5,000/-
02	28.8	Diary No.28697 of 2017	186	Rs.5,000/-
03	28.9	Diary No.28698 of 2017	187	Rs.5,000/-
04	28.10	Diary No.30627 of 2017	192	Rs.5,000/-
05	28.13	Diary No.32100 of 2017	220	Rs.10,000/-
06	28.15	Diary No.32119 of 2017	180	Rs.5,000/-
07	28.16	Diary No.32369 of 2017	223	Rs.10,000/-
08	28.29	Diary No.37830 of 2017	253	Rs.10,000/-
09	28.33	Diary No.37948 of 2017	251	Rs.10,000/-
10	28.51	Diary No.30 of 2018	310	Rs.10,000/-
11	28.52	Diary No.39 of 2018	298	Rs.10,000/-
12	28.55	Diary No.2691 of 2018	327	Rs.10,000/-

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No(s).	Delay In Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)	Costs Imposed per SLP
13	28.56	Diary No.3661 of 2018	295	Rs.10,000/-
14	28.57	Diary No.5317 of 2018	310	Rs.10,000/-
15	28.58	Diary No.5319 of 2018	310	Rs.10,000/-
16	28.59	Diary No.5941 of 2018	313	Rs.10,000/-
17	28.60	Diary No.6950 of 2018	320	Rs.10,000/-
18	28.72	Diary No.23152 of 2018	480	Rs.10,000/-
19	28.73	Diary No.23156 of 2018	459	Rs.10,000/-
20	28.74	Diary No.23157 of 2018	478	Rs.10,000/-
21	28.75	Diary No.23161 of 2018	468	Rs.10,000/-
22	28.76	Diary No.8876 of 2019	737	Rs.20,000/-
23	28.82	Diary No.28377 of 2021	783	Rs.20,000/-
24	28.91	Diary No.8880 of 2019	723	Rs.20,000/-
25	28.99	Diary No.18345 of 2019	380	Rs.10,000/-
26	28.100	Diary No.18349 of 2019	471	Rs.10,000/-
27	28.101	Diary No.18352 of 2019	457	Rs.10,000/-
28	28.102	Diary No.18354 of 2019	440	Rs.10,000/-
29	28.103	Diary No.18355 of 2019	457	Rs.10,000/-
30	28.104	Diary No.18357 of 2019	428	Rs.10,000/-
31	28.105	Diary No.18359 of 2019	380	Rs.10,000/-
32	28.106	Diary No.18367 of 2019	428	Rs.10,000/-
33	28.107	Diary No.18369 of 2019	391	Rs.10,000/-
34	28.108	Diary No.18373 of 2019	440	Rs.10,000/-
35	28.109	Diary No.18908 of 2019	474	Rs.10,000/-
36	28.110	Diary No.18912 of 2019	443	Rs.10,000/-
37	28.111	Diary No.18928 of 2019	394	Rs.10,000/-
38	28.112	Diary No.18960 of 2019	446	Rs.10,000/-
39	28.113	Diary No.19565 of 2019	453	Rs.10,000/-
40	28.114	Diary No.19598 of 2019	453	Rs.10,000/-
41	28.115	Diary No.19751 of 2019	393	Rs.10,000/-
42	28.116	Diary No.19829 of 2019	394	Rs.10,000/-

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No(s).	Delay In Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)	Costs Imposed per SLP
43	28.117	Diary No.20291 of 2019	449	Rs.10,000/-
44	28.118	Diary No.20292 of 2019	440	Rs.10,000/-
45	28.119	Diary No.20293 of 2019	455	Rs.10,000/-
46	28.120	Diary No.20296 of 2019	449	Rs.10,000/-
47	28.121	Diary No.20585 of 2019	444	Rs.10,000/-
48	28.123	Diary No.20755 of 2019	449	Rs.10,000/-
49	28.124	Diary No.24990 of 2019	609	Rs.20,000/-
50	28.130	Diary No.36905 of 2019	588	Rs.20,000/-
51	28.135	Diary No.151 of 2020	1045	Rs.30,000/-
52	28.137	Diary No.12898 of 2020	818	Rs.20,000/-
53	28.138	Diary No.25051 of 2020	1357	Rs.30,000/-
54	28.139	Diary No.1099 of 2021	1049	Rs.30,000/-
55	28.140	Diary No.27679 of 2021	776	Rs.20,000/-
56	28.142	Diary No.28405 of 2021	399	Rs.10,000/-
57	28.143	Diary No.29160 of 2021	783	Rs.20,000/-
58	28.145	Diary No.29614 of 2021	800	Rs.20,000/-
59	28.146	Diary No.31454 of 2021	809	Rs.20,000/-
60	28.147	Diary No.31463 of 2021	802	Rs.20,000/-
61	28.148	Diary No.31552 of 2021	761	Rs.20,000/-
62	28.149	Diary No.149 of 2022	1400	Rs.30,000/-
63	28.152	Diary No.22628 of 2022	836	Rs.20,000/-
64	28.153	Diary No.22632 of 2022	1237	Rs.30,000/-
65	28.154	Diary No.22636 of 2022	836	Rs.20,000/-
66	28.155	Diary No.18908 of 2023	2936	Rs.50,000/-
67	28.156	Diary No.19265 of 2023	2939	Rs.50,000/-
68	28.172	Diary No.8670 of 2019	722	Rs.20,000/-
69	28.180	Diary No.18364 of 2019	380	Rs.10,000/-
70	28.181	Diary No.18371 of 2019	391	Rs.10,000/-
71	28.183	Diary No.28351 of 2019	465	Rs.10,000/-
72	28.186	Diary No.24255 of 2020	1379	Rs.30,000/-

Sr. No.	Item No.	Case No(s).	Delay In Filing the SLP(s) (In Days)	Costs Imposed per SLP
73	28.187	Diary No.28725 of 2020	1394	Rs.30,000/-
74	28.190	Diary No.18989 of 2023	2937	Rs.50,000/-
75	28.191	Diary No.20110 of 2023	2296	Rs.40,000/-
76	28.192	Diary No.60331 of 2024	753	Rs.20,000/-

The costs imposed shall be deposited with the Supreme Court Mediation Centre on or before 05.05.2025.

2. Leave granted.

3. These appeals assail the orders passed by the Punjab and Haryana High Court in several writ petitions in respect of acquisition of various parcels of land from time to time by issuance of notifications under Sections 4 and 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (for short "LA Act, 1894"). The respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers have assailed the acquisition process. It may be that in certain cases the contentions with regard to the validity of the acquisition were raised in the Writ Petitions filed by them. However, the fact remains that pursuant to the enforcement of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as "2013 Act"), fresh Writ Petitions were filed seeking relief under sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act. In certain cases, amendments to the pending Writ Petitions may have also been made while in certain other Writ Petitions while assailing the process of acquisition under Sections 4 and 6 as well as under other provisions of the 1894 Act, applications seeking relief under Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act have also been made. Various contentions were also raised under sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act before the High Court.

4. At this stage, it is necessary to note that this Court, in the case of ***Pune Municipal Corporation vs. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 SCC 183 ("Pune Municipal Corporation")*** had interpreted sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act by granting relief on the basis of the said interpretation. Thereafter, the matter was considered by a five-Judge Bench of this Court which was the case of ***Indore Development Authority vs. Manoharlal, (2020) 8 SCC***

129 ("Indore Development Authority"), which set aside the earlier judgment of this Court in ***Pune Municipal Corporation.*** Paragraphs 365 to 367 of the judgment in ***Indore Development Authority*** are extracted as under:

> "365. Resultantly, the decision rendered in Pune Municipal Corpn. [Pune Municipal Corpn. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 SCC 183 : (2014) 2 SCC (Civ) 274] is hereby overruled and all other decisions in which Pune Municipal Corpn. [Pune Municipal Corpn. v. Harakchand Misirimal Solanki, (2014) 3 SCC 183 : (2014) 2 SCC (Civ) 274] 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: (2015) 2 SCC (Civ) 298] cannot be said to be laying down good law, is overruled and other decisions following the same are also overruled. In Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra [Indore Development Authority v. Shailendra, (2018) 3 SCC 412 : (2018) 2 SCC (Civ) 426] , 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.
>
> 366. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we answer the questions as under:
>
> 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.
>
> 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.

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 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 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.

367. Let the matters be placed before appropriate Bench for consideration on merits."

5. It must be mentioned at this stage that in some of the impugned judgments, the High Court has followed the earlier judgment of this Court in ***Pune Municipal Corporation*** and has granted relief to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers.

6. Being aggrieved by the said orders, the State of Haryana and others have preferred these appeals.

7. We wish to observe that if, today, these appeals have to be considered on merits then obviously the judgment passed by the five-Judge Bench of this Court in the case of ***Indore Development Authority***

would have to be applied to the facts of each case. It would call for a determination of facts as stated in Paragraphs 366.3 and 366.4 of the said judgment as well as the other relevant paragraphs of the said judgment.

8. The determination of the factual aspects in each of these cases would inevitably call for the consideration of the original records and hearing of the arguments by the respective parties on the factual aspects of each of these cases.

9. In the circumstances, we find it just and proper to set aside the impugned orders and remand these matters to the High Court for reconsideration of the Writ Petitions filed by the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers and to dispose of those Writ Petitions on the basis of the recent judgment of this Court in ***Indore Development Authority*** by applying the ratio and the observations of the said judgment to the facts of each case as they emanate in each of the cases.

10. At this stage, learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the respondents submitted that during the pendency of the Writ Petitions before the High Court and thereafter during the pendency of these appeals before this Court the respondents had the benefit of orders of *status quo*. Since this Court is remanding the matters to the High Court, the said orders of *status quo* may be continued in those cases where such orders prevail till the disposal of the writ petitions.

11. Learned Solicitor General appearing for the appellants very fairly submitted that since this Court is remanding the matters to the High Court, the order of *status quo* which were prevailing in those cases may be continued till the disposal of the writ petitions by the High Court.

12. In the circumstances, we find that the order of *status quo* prevailing in the Writ Petitions preferred by the respondents herein ought to continue till the disposal of the Writ Petitions by the High Court.

13. Learned senior counsel and learned counsel appearing for the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers further submitted that there were certain contentions raised with regard to the validity of the acquisition itself inasmuch as the process undertaken under Sections 4 and 6 and other provisions of the LA Act 1894 were also assailed apart from contentions being raised under sub-section (2) of

Section 24 of the 2013 Act. That since the High Court has disposed of the writ petitions and granted relief on the basis of the earlier judgment of this Court in ***Pune Municipal Corporation,*** the validity of the acquisition as such may not have been gone into, inasmuch as only sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act may have been applied and relief may have been granted to the parties. Therefore, liberty may be reserved to the respondents to raise all available contentions on the validity of the acquisition itself.

14. Take note of the said contention in such cases, we reserve liberty to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers to raise all available contentions with regard to the validity of the acquisition which have been undertaken under the LA Act of 1894 before the High Court. It is needless to observe that those contentions would be considered on their own merits *de hors* any contention raised under sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act.

15. It was further contended by learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers that between the period of the impugned orders of the High court and today when the matters are being remanded to the High Court for reconsideration there have been certain developments, there may be third party rights created, there may be other developmental activities which have taken place on the land sought to be acquired. This is because there may have been quashing of the acquisition notifications and/or orders being passed by holding that there was lapse of acquisition under sub-section (2) of Section 24 of the 2013 Act and further on the basis of other contentions which were accepted by the High Court and there may also have been release of those lands to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers as a consequence.

16. Learned senior counsel and learned counsel for respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers contended that having regard to the long lapse of time between the quashing of the acquisition or a declaration that they have lapsed and the matters now being remanded to the High court for reconsideration and there being subsequent developments with regard to the subject land in question, liberty may be reserved to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers to raise all contentions on the basis of equity and in accordance with law. We find that such a request made is reasonable

and in the circumstances, we reserve liberty to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers to raise those contentions before the High Court. Obviously appellant-State will have an opportunity to also oppose those contentions in accordance with law.

17. It is further noted that in certain cases there may be death of the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers and there has been no application filed for substitution of the deceased before this Court. Since we are remanding the matters to the High Court, it is obvious that the High Court will issue fresh notices to the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers if they have not appeared before the High Court in those cases and where there is demise of any respondent, the legal heirs have to be impleaded having regard to the applications that are to be filed wherever there are no applications filed for impleadment of legal heirs of deceased respondents herein.

    In respect of other cases where the parties are represented by their respective counsel before this Court, we find that they ought to be permitted to appear before the High Court on 05.05.2025 without expecting any separate notices to be issued to them by the High Court. However, if for any reason, there is non-appearance of the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers who are writ petitioners before the High Court then fresh notices may also be issued to the Writ Petitioners before the High Court either through their counsel or directly to the said parties.

18. Learned senior counsel and learned counsel for the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers submitted that in several cases the State has made concessions before the High Court and there may have also been consent orders made by the High Court based on the concessions of the State. Since we are not interfering with the correctness or otherwise of the impugned order(s) and are remanding the matters to the High Court purely on the basis of the recent judgment of this Court in ***Indore Development Authority***, we do not wish to make any observations on the said concessions made on behalf of the State or any consent orders passed by the High Court on the basis of the concessions made by the State.

19. It is needless to observe that if the respondents-land owners/subsequent purchasers wish to take advantage of the concessions or the consent orders made by the High Court on the basis of the concessions made by the State, the same shall be considered having

regard to the respective contentions advanced at the Bar and in accordance with law.

20. All other contentions which are germane to the adjudication of the Writ Petitions could be raised by both sides.

21. We place on record our appreciation for the assistance rendered by learned counsel, Mrs. Vanshaja Shukla and Ms. Diksha Rai Goswami for the respondents-land owners and Mr. Akshay Amritanshu and Mr. Samar Vijay Singh for the appellant-State as nodal counsel in these appeals.

22. The costs imposed shall be deposited with the Supreme Court Mediation Centre on or before 05.05.2025. In case the amounts of costs are not deposited, the High Court shall not hear the appellants herein until the filing of copies of the receipts/acknowledgement before the Registry of this Court as well as the High Court and by serving a copy of the same to the respondents' counsel herein.

These appeals are disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

We reiterate that we have not made any observation on the merits of the matters.

Result of the case: Appeals disposed of.

Headnotes prepared by: Ankit Gyan