

DLNT010018892022



IN THE COURT OF SH. SIDHARTH MATHUR  
DISTRICT JUDGE-01 (NORTH):ROHINI COURTS: DELHI

LAC No. 28/2022

In the matter of:-

1. **Ramesh Kumar**  
S/o Sh. Bhagat Singh  
R/o Village and Post Officer Karala,  
Delhi – 110082.
2. **Goverdhan @ Gordhan S/o late Sh. Pyare Lal (since deceased) through his LRs:-**
  - i. **Ompati** **daughter**  
W/o Sh. Ranbir  
R/o Kilohrad, Kilohrad, Sandal Kalan (166),  
PO: Sandal Kalan, Dist. Sonipat, Haryana – 131001.
  - ii. **Mayawati** **daughter**  
W/o Sh. Hem Chander Khatri  
R/o H. No. 153, Jaton Wali Gali, Tikri Khurd,  
North West, Delhi – 110040.
  - iii. **Anita Devi** **daughter in law**  
W/o Sh. Satbir Singh  
R/o H. No. F-112, near Community Centre,  
Karala, North West, Delhi – 110081.
  - iv. **Parveen Mathur** **grandson**  
S/o Sh. Satbir Singh  
R/o F-112, near Stadium VPO, Karala,

North West Delhi – 110081.

**v. Amit Mathur** **grandson**

S/o Sh. Satbir Singh  
R/o 112, Najdeek Community Centre,  
Karala, North West, Delhi – 110081.

**vi. Raj Roop Mathur** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o 160, Pana Satgrha, Karala,  
North West Delhi – 110081.

**vii. Jasbir Singh** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o 160, Pana Satgrha, Karala,  
North West Delhi – 110081.

**viii. Gajraj** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o 473, Karewari (198), Karewari,  
Sonipat, Haryana – 131024.

**ix. Kuldeep** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o 160, near M.S. Model School,  
Satgraha Panna, Karala,  
North-West, Delhi – 110081.

**x. Pradeep Mathur** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o near M.S. Model School, 160, Satghar,  
Karala, North West Delhi – 110081.

**xi. Lalit Mathur** **son**

S/o late Sh. Goverdhan @ late Gordhan  
R/o V.P.O Karala, North-West, Delhi – 110081.

**..... Petitioners**

***Versus***

**1. Union Of India through**  
Land Acquisition Collector (N)  
Office at Alipur, Delhi.

**2. Delhi Development Authority**  
through its Vice-Chairman  
Vikas Sadan, INA, New Delhi.

**..... Respondents**

Award No.	04/2002-03
Village	Pansali
Date of possession	12.05.2000 & 22.06.2002
Notification U/s 4 LA Act	F.10(29)/96/L&B/LA/ 11394dt. 27.10.1999
Notification U/s 6 LA Act	F.10(29)/96/L&B/LA/20 dt. 03.04.2000
Date of Announcement of LAC Award	03.04.2002

Date of Receipt of Reference : 14.03.2022

Date of Arguments : 16.03.2026

Date of Decision: 16.03.2026

**REFERENCE PETITION UNDER SECTION 18 OF THE**  
**LAND ACQUISITION ACT 1894**

**AWARD:**

**(BY THE COURT U/S 26 OF LAND ACQUISITION ACT-**  
**1894 ON REFERENCE PETITION U/S 18 OF THE ACT):**

1. This is a reference made by the Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as '**LAC**') under section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (hereinafter referred to as '**LA Act**'). The reference was initiated on a petition made by the petitioner who was aggrieved by the amount

of compensation awarded by the LAC vide above-referred award.

2. As per the reference, a large tract of land measuring 1223 bighas 06 biswas of village Pansali, Delhi, was acquired by the Government for the purpose of Rohini Residential Scheme Phase IV&V. The notification under Section 4 of The LA Act as mentioned on the index page was issued. The Declaration under Section 6 was made as mentioned on the index page. Thereafter, above-referred award was announced by the LAC. The LAC determined the market price of the acquired land as Rs.12.16 lacs per acre.
3. The petitioner, being dissatisfied with the market value determined by the LAC, filed the present petition u/s 18 of the LA Act, seeking reference to this court. The LAC forwarded the same to this Court for adjudication.
4. The case of the petitioner is that petitioner was the recorded bhumidhar of the land bearing khasra numbers as mentioned in revised Statement u/s 19 of the LA Act that was annexed with the present reference, situated within the Revenue Estate of Village Pansali, Delhi (the said land). The said land was acquired vide notification dated

27.10.1999.

5. The petitioner has challenged the said award *inter alia* on the ground of inadequacy of compensation and incorrect assessment of market value of land *inter-alia* due to non-consideration of relevant factors like potentiality and fertility of the suit land, the surrounding colonies and developed areas, the market value of the adjoining areas/villages, the sale deeds of other lands of the contemporary period, nearness to the National Highway and industrial areas, amenities available in the suit land etc.
6. The petitioner has prayed compensation at enhanced rate besides interest thereon and solatium in addition to the compensation.
7. The respondent no.1/the Union of India (UOI) /Land Acquisition Collector and respondent no.2/Delhi Development Authority (DDA) contested the reference petition by filing their respective Written Statements.
8. The petition has been contested mainly on the ground that the LAC awarded adequate compensation to the petitioner after taking into consideration all the relevant factors and therefore, LAC has correctly assessed the market value of the land after taking into account the

market rates prevailing at the time of notification under Section 4 of LA Act.

9. During the proceedings, an application u/o 1 Rule 10 CPC was moved on behalf of applicant / Goverdhan for his impleadment in the present petition. To this application, no objection was given on behalf of counsel for the petitioner. Accordingly, the said application was allowed vide order dt. 16.03.2026. And as per the settlement order dt. 26.04.2013 passed u/s 30-31 of L.A. Act, **the applicant / Goverdhan (now his LRs) was held to be entitled to 31.70% of the total compensation and the LRs of late Sh. Fateh Singh i.e. Jagdish, Gian Chand (deceased) through LRs Rajwanti, Parvesh, Vikash and Rekha, Bhagat Singh @ Bharat Singh (deceased) through LR Ramesh, Hargyan Singh (deceased) through LRs Ajay and Vijay were held to be entitled to remaining compensation i.e. 68.30% as per their shares, if any.**
10. Applicant Goverdhan/ petitioner no. 2 was expired and consequently, an application u/o 22 Rule 3 CPC was moved to implead his LRs in the present petition. The said application was supported with death certificate and SMC. Accordingly, the said application was allowed on

16.03.2026.

11. Admission-denial of documents was not pressed.

The following issues were framed :-

- i) **Whether the petitioner is entitled to enhancement in compensation, if so, to what amount?**
- ii) **Relief.**

12. In evidence, the counsel for petitioner on behalf of petitioner has relied upon the judgment in a case titled as Kuldeep Singh vs. UOI LAC No.359A/08 by Sh. Amit Kumar, ADJ on 05.01.2013 and also the evidence led in said case.

13. The respondent no.1/Union of India (UOI), in its evidence, tendered the award as Ex.R1. The respondent no.2/D.D.A adopted the evidence led on behalf of the respondent no.1/ Union of India.

14. I have heard the Ld. Counsels for the parties and have also carefully considered the record. My issue-wise findings are given as under:-

**FINDINGS ON ISSUE NO. 1 :-**

15. Petitioner has contended that valuation of land determined by LAC is not reasonable as LAC has not adopted the correct method of valuation. However, he has not led any evidence to show as to how the LAC was

wrong in fixing market value of land. During arguments, Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has only relied upon the judgment titled as **Kuldeep Singh & Ors., vs. UOI LAC No.359A/08** (*decided by Id. Predecessor Sh. Amit Kumar, ADJ, Rohini Court, vide judgement dated 05.01.2013*), and conceded that award be passed in terms of the said judgment and the same enhancement which was granted in the said judgment be also granted to petitioner.

16. **In Kuldeep Singh's case**, an elaborate and detailed discussion was made before determining the amount of compensation. With respect to the land of the village Pansali (involved herein), acquired through the same notification (as made herein), the Id. Predecessor Judge determined the market value of the land as Rs. *12,85,650/- per acre*.

17. Since, no different evidence has been led by the petitioner in the present case, I have no reason to give a different treatment to the land of the petitioner and to give a determination, different from that determined in the **Kuldeep Singh's case**. The fair market value of the acquired land is adjudicated as Rs. *12,85,650/- per acre* as determined in **Kuldeep Singh's case**.

18. Accordingly, I hold that the petitioners would be entitled to market value @ Rs.12,85,650/-per acre in accordance with their shares as per the order passed u/s 30-31 of L.A. Act.
19. Petitioners have also claimed compensation for crops, tree, tubewell etc. However, the petitioners have failed to lead any evidence to substantiate their claim or to establish that they were not awarded sufficient compensation for same. Accordingly, I hold that petitioners are not entitled to any enhancement in compensation on this count.
20. Besides above, petitioners shall be entitled to other statutory benefits under the LA Act viz. 12% **additional amount** [as per section 23 (1A)] and 30% **solatium** [u/s 23 (2)] and will be entitled to **interest** under Section 28 of L.A Act on the fair market value @ 9% per annum for the first year and @ 15% for subsequent year till the making of payment of enhanced compensation by LAC as per provision of Section 28 of the Act.

Issue no. 1 is decided accordingly.

21. **Findings on Issue No.2 – RELIEF**

In view of the findings on Issue no.1, the petitioners

are granted the following reliefs: -

- i) **fair market value** @ Rs. 12,85,650/- *per acre* for the acquired land as per revised statement u/s 19 of the LA Act in accordance with the shares of the petitioners, which shall be determinable as per the order passed u/s 30-31 of L.A. Act.
- ii) **additional amount** @ 12% per annum on the fair market value u/s 23 (1A) of the LA Act , from the date of notification u/s 4 of the LA Act till the date of award or dispossession, whichever is earlier ;
- iii) **solatium** u/s 23 (2) of LA Act @ 30% on the enhanced amount of market value;
- iv) **interest** under Section 28 of L.A Act @ 9% per annum for the first year from the date of dispossession and at the rate of 15% per annum on the difference between the enhanced compensation awarded by this court and the compensation awarded by the LAC for the subsequent period till its payment ;

20. The share(s) of the petitioner(s) would be determinable as per the revised statement u/s 19 of the L.A.

Act on record and the said statement shall constitute a part of this award.

21. Reference petition stands answered. Parties to bear their own costs. A copy of this award be sent to the LAC for necessary information, action and expeditious compliance for remittance of the amount. File be consigned to record room.

**Announced in the  
Open Court on 16.03.2026**

**(Sidharth Mathur)  
District Judge-01/North,  
Rohini Courts/Delhi**

Visit [ecourts.gov.in](https://ecourts.gov.in) for updates or download mobile app “eCourts Services” from Android or iOS