



IN THE COURT OF SH. SIDHARTH MATHUR
DISTRICT JUDGE (NORTH-01): ROHINI COURTS : DELHI
LAC No. 66/2022

Mohinder Singh Rana
S/o Sh. Zile Singh Rana
R/o 565, Govt. Road,
near Govt. Ration Shop,
VPO Mukhmelpur, North West
Delhi – 110036.

..... **Petitioner**

Versus

- 1. Union Of India through**
Land Acquisition Collector(North)
Office at DM (North), Alipur, Delhi.
- 2. Delhi Development Authority (DDA)**
through its Vice – Chairman,
Vikas Sadan, INA, New Delhi.

..... **Respondents**

Award No.	11/1996-97
Village	Mukhmail Pur
Notification U/S 4	F.11(34)/91/L&B/LA/(i) dt. 14.01.1994
Notification U/s 6	F.11(34)/91/L&B(11)/LA (ii) dt. 21.12.1994.
Date of announcement of Award	18.12.1996
Date of possession	20.01.1995

Date of Receipt of Reference : 19.05.2022

Date of Arguments : 01.04.2026

Date of Decision: 01.04.2026

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 LAC Award, a large tract of land measuring 303 bigha 18 biswas including the land of the petitioner of village Mukhmail Pur, Delhi, was acquired by the Govt. for a public purpose namely "Sewerage Treatment Plant for Narela Town under P.D.D.". Notification under Section 4 and Section 17 A of The Land Acquisition Act, 1894 were issued on 14.01.1994. Declaration under Section 6 was made on 21.12.1994. Thereafter, Award bearing no. 11/1996-97 was announced by Land Acquisition Collector (hereinafter referred to as LAC). The LAC determined the market price of the acquired land as Rs.96,875/- per bigha for land falling in Block 'A', Rs.83750/- per bigha for land falling in 'B' Block.
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 Land Acquisition Collector forwarded the same to this court, for adjudication.

4. The brief facts of the petitioner's case is that petitioner is the bhumidar(s) of the land bearing khasra numbers as mentioned in Statement u/s 19 of the LA Act that was annexed with the present reference and admitted by the petitioner during the stage of admission/denial of documents in the statement u/s 19 of the L.A. Act, situated within the Revenue Estate of Village Mukhmailpur, Delhi (the said land). The said land was acquired vide notification dated **14.01.1994**.
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, the 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. An application u/o 1 Rule 10 CPC was filed for deletion of Delhi Jal Board (DJB). The said application was allowed vide order dt. 26.11.2024 and DJB was deleted from array of parties. On the same day, DDA was impleaded as R-1 in the present petition since DDA is the beneficiary of land in question. Thereafter, the respondent no.1/the Union of India (UOI)/Land Acquisition Collector and respondent no.2/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.

In Written Statement, the contentions of R-1 adopted by the R-2/DDA.

9. During the proceedings, an application u/s 151 CPC was moved for correction in the name of the petitioner from **“Mahender Singh S/o Jile Singh”** to **“Mohinder Singh Rana S/o Zile Singh Rana”**. The said application was allowed vide

order dt. 16.03.2026.

10. During admission-denial of documents, the counsel for petitioner admitted the statement given u/s 19 of the Act.

The following issues were framed:-

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

ii) **Relief.**

11. In evidence, the counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the evidence led on behalf of petitioner in case titled ***“Jai Narain vs. UOI LAC No.147/99 decided on 15.12.1999”*** by Id. Court of Ms. Reva Khetarpal, ADJ (as her lordship then was).

12. The respondent no.1/Union of India, in its evidence, tendered the award as Ex.R1. The respondent no.2/Delhi Development Authority (DDA) adopted the evidence led by respondent no.1/UOI.

13. Final arguments have been heard and record has been carefully perused. My issue-wise findings are given hereinafter.

FINDINGS ON ISSUE NO. 1 :-

14. 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 support his contention as to how the LAC was wrong in fixing market value of land. Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment titled as “**Jai Narain vs. UOI LAC No.147/99 decided on 15.12.1999 by ld. Court of Ms. Reva Khetarpal, ADJ**” (as her lordship then was) & “**Partap Singh & Ors. Vs. UOI & Anr. LAC No. 06/2017 decided on 08.03.2022 by ld. Court of Sh. Satish Kumar, ADJ-01**” and conceded that award be passed in terms of the said judgments and the same enhancement which was granted in the said judgments be also granted to him.

15. In **Jai Narain's Case & Pratap Singh's Case (Supra)**, the market value of the land as Rs.1,40,230/- per acre was determined for category A land by this Court.

16. 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 **Jai Narain's Case & Pratap Singh's Case (Supra)**. The fair market value of the acquired land is adjudicated as Rs.1,40,230/- per acre for category A land.

17. Petitioner has also claimed compensation for crops, tree, tubewell etc. However, the petitioner has failed to lead

any evidence to substantiate his claim or to establish that he was not awarded sufficient compensation for same. Accordingly, I hold that petitioner is not entitled to any enhancement in compensation on this count.

18. It was argued on behalf of R-2/DDA that the land has been given on lease to Delhi Jal Board (DJB) whereby Delhi Jal Board (DJB) is the ultimate beneficiary, who should be made to pay for the compensation. I do not agree with the submission. The High Court of Delhi while dealing with the liability of DDA to pay the compensation qua Pratap Singh's leading case in CM(M) 1977/2023 & CM Appl. 61949/2023 titled as "**Delhi Jal Board Vs. Pratap Singh Thr. LRs & Ors.**" relating to the notification in question had held that the enhanced compensation shall be paid by DDA, not DJB. Accordingly, this argument is rejected.

19. Besides above, petitioner 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.

Findings on Issue No.2 – RELIEF

20. In view of the findings on Issue no.1, the petitioner/s are granted the following reliefs: -

1. **fair market value @** Rs.1,40,230/- per acre for category A land, for the acquired land as per statement u/s 19 of the LA Act;
2. **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 ;
3. **solutium** u/s 23 (2) of LA Act @ 30% on the enhanced amount of market value;
4. **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 ;

21. The share(s) of the petitioner(s) would be determinable as per the judgment u/s 30-31 of the LA Act bearing LAC No. 1666/16, titled as Union of India Vs. Pardeep Kumar & Ors. and statement u/s 19 of the L.A. Act proved on record and the said statement and the said judgment u/s 30-31 of L.A. Act shall constitute a part of this award.

22. 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 01.04.2026**

(Sidharth Mathur)

District Judge-01/North, Rohini Courts/Delhi.

Visit ecourts.gov.in for updates or download mobile app "eCourts Services" from Android or iOS