

KAGD010003962019



**IN THE COURT OF ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
JUDGE, GADAG**

Dated this the 23rd day of September 2023

PRESENT

Sri. Rajeshwara S Shetty, B.A, LL.M.,
ADDL. DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
GADAG

**LAC No.s 19/19 to 22/19, 24 to 32/19, 34 to 37/19,
39 to 56/19, 58 to 61/19, 68 to 70/2019 &
72/19 to 78/19**

**Claimant in
LAC No. 19/2019**

Sri. Narayanappa S/o Hanamappa Naganur,
Age : 45 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o
Sombhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

**Claimant in
LAC No. 20/2019**

Krishnagouda S/o Ramanagouda Hosamani,
Age : 38 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sombhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

**Claimant in
LAC No. 21/2019**

Sri. Nasir S/o Dadasaheb Kunnibhavi,

Age : 55 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Hanumangaradi Oni,
Kumarvyas road, Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 22/2019

Sri Umeshappa Virupakshappa Elager, Age :
60 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi, Tq
& Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No.24/2019

Sri. Ishwarappa Devappa Elager, Age : Major,
Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi Village, Tq &
Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No.25/2019

Sri. Venkaraddi S/o Hanamaraddi Naganur,
Age : 35 years, Occ: Agriculture, R/o
Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 26/2019

Sri. Devaraddi Fairaddi Honnaraddi,
Age : 34 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 27/2019

- 1) Sri.Vasappa S/o Hanamappa Naganur,
Age : 61 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.
- 2) Sri. Narayanappa S/o Hanamappa
Naganur, Age : 61 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No.28/2019

Sri. Indrakumar S/o Multanmallaji Bafana,
Age : 50 years, Occ: - R/o 9, 1st Floor, Near
Abbigeri Mill, Mahaveer Colony, Gadag, Tq &
Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No.29/2019

- 1) Mudakanagouda S/o Venkanagouda
Bhandi, Age : 63 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur Village, Ta & Dist : Gadag.
- 2) Hanamantagouda S/o Venkanagouda
Bhandi, Age : 56 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur Village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 30/2019

Sri. Mallappa S/o Ramappa Doni,
Age : 55 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 31/2019

Sri. Hemaraddi S/o Krishnaraddi Doni,
Age : 70 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 32/2019

Sri. Peersab Huchchusab Shalavadi,
Age : 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Lakkundi village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 34/2019

Sri. Ravi @ Ravichandra S/o Mallappa
Nagaral, R/o Papanashi, Tq : Dist : Gadag

Claimant in
LAC No. 35/2019

Sri. Shamareddi S/o Govindappa
Bhandi, Age : 57 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No.36/2019

1) Devakka S/o Kanakapur Bhandi,

Age : 63 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur Village, Ta & Dist : Gadag.

2) Krishna S/o Kanakappa Bhandi,

Age : 27 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur Village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in

LAC No.37/2019

1) Gurunathsa S/o Rajansa Merawade

Age : 54 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Health Camp Betageri, Gadag.

2) Tippansa S/o Rajansa Merawade

Age : 61 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Health Camp Betageri, Gadag.

3) Nagendrasa S/o Rajansa Merawade

Age : 40 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Health Camp Betageri, Gadag.

4) Venkatesh Urf Venkusa S/o Rajansa

Merawade, Age : 63 years,

Occ: Agriculture, R/o Health Camp

Betageri, Gadag.

5) Vandanabai W/o Mahadevasa Merwade,

Age : 52 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Health Camp, Betageri, Gadag.

6) Shridhar S/o Mahadevasa Merwade,

Age : 16 years, Occ: Student,

R/o Health Camp, Betageri, Gadag.

7) Priya S/o Mahadevasa Merwade,

Age : 14 years, Occ: Student,

R/o Health Camp, Betageri, Gadag.

(Claimant No. 6 and 7 are minors

they are represented by their

minor guardian mother Sl. No. 5)

Claimants in

LAC No.39/2019

Mallappa S/o Neelappa Sasvihalli,
Since deceased by his LRs.

1) Neelavva W/o Fakkirappa Kuradagi,

Age : 80 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :
Gadag.

2) Shivavva W/o Sannakenchanagouda

Malipatil, Age : 76 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :
Gadag.

3) Kuberappa S/o Mallappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 55 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :
Gadag.

4) Basappa S/o Mallappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

5) Ashok S/o Mallappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 48 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

6) Gangamma W/o Ningappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 46 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

7) Ningappa S/o Mallappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 32 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

(Since deceased represented by LRs)

7a) Devakka W/o Ningappa Sasvihalli,

Age : Major, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

7b) Ganesh S/o Ningappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 14 years, Occ: Student

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

7c) Dinesh S/o Ningappa Sasvihalli,

Age : 9 years, Occ: Student,

R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :

Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 40/2019 :

Virupakshappa Parasappa Parapur,
Age : 41 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Talageri Street, D.C. Main Road,
Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 41/2019

Sri. Sudhir S/o Vasudev Havalad,
Age : 39 years, Occ: Agriculture
and Business, R/o Health Camp,
Ashok Road, Betageri.

Claimant in
LAC No. 42/2019

Sri. Mudakanagouda S/o Venkanagouda
Bhandi, Age : 63 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Sambhapur village, Tq & Dist :Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 43/2019

- 1) Dariyasab Urf Davalsab S/o Moulasab
Dalakhanavar, Age : 58 years,
Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.
- 2) Allasab S/o Moulasab Dalakhanavar,
Age : 42 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 44/2019

Kulkarni Basayya Kallayya,
R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 45/2019

Sri. Shivappa S/o Hanamappa Elager
Since deceased by his LRs.

- 1) Yallavva W/o Shivappa Elager,
Age : 65 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.
- 2) Yamanurappa S/o Shivappa Elager
Age : 36 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 46/2019

Sri. Chandrashekharappa S/o
Sannabasappa Hallikeri, Age : 47 years,
Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 47/2019

Hanumantappa @ Hanamappa
Channabasappa Hyoti.
Since deceased by his Lrs.

- 1) Yallavva W/o Basavaraj Kattimani

Age : Major, R/o Papanashi,

Tq & Dist : Gadag..

2) Devakka D/o Hanamappa Hyati

Age : Major, R/o Papanashi,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

3) Dyamakka D/o Hanamappa Hyati.

Age : Major, R/o Papanashi,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 48/2019

Sri. Manjappa S/o Shiddappa Hyati,

Age : 30 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 49/2019

Sri. Manjunath S/o Yallappa Jogin,

Age : 42 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Papanashi, Tq : & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 50/2019

1) Mallikarjun S/o Shankrappa Itagi,

Age : 47 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

2) Kallappa S/o Shankrappa Itagi,

Age : 49 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No.51/2019

Sri. Balappa S/o Balappa Elager,
Age: 69 years, Occ: Agriculture.
R/o Papanashi, Tq & Dist : Gadag.
Dist: Gadag

Claimant in
LAC No. 52/2019

Devendragouda S/o Ramanagouda goudra
(Since deceased by his Lrs.)

- 1) Ramanagouda S/o Devendragouda
Goudra @ Patil, Age: Major,
Occ: Agriculture. R/o Papanashi,
Tq & Dist: Gadag.
- 2) Lokanagouda S/o Devendragouda
Goudra Urf Patil, Age : Major,
Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.
- 3) Yallanagouda S/o Devendragouda
Goudra Urf Patil, Age : Major,
Occ: Agriculture, R/o Papanashi,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 53/2019

Ratna Virupakshappa Parapur,

Age: 38 years, Occ: Agriculture.

R/o Talageri Street, D.C. Mill, Gadag

Claimant in
LAC No.54/2019

Yacharappa S/o Dyamanna Nidagundi,

Age 45 years, Occ: Agriculture,

Kariyavar Oni, R/o Lakkundi,

Tq & Dist : Gadag

Claimant in
LAC No. 55/2019

Fakeerappa S/o Dyamanna Nidagundi,

Age : 52 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Kariyavar Oni, R/o Lakkundi,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 56/2019

Ramavva Urf Neelavva W/o Vitupakhappa
Ambakki.

(Since deceased by her Lrs.)

1) Shantavva W/o Shivaputrappa Shantagiri,

Age : 54 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Hulkoti, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

2) Shantavva Urf Anasavva W/o Malleshappa

Teli, Age : 52 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Maratha Galli, Shirahatti, Dist : Gadag.

3) Suvarna W/o Shiddappa Ayatti,

Age : 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Alagawadi, Tq : Navalgund,

Dist : Dharwad.

4) Gangavva W/o Banappagouda Tankankalla,

Age : 46 years, Occ; Agriculture, R/o Bevir,

Tq : Yalburga, Dist : Koppal.

Claimant in

LAC No. 58/2019

Devanagouda S/o Gurunathagouda

Bhandi, Age : 53 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in

LAC No. 59/2019

1) Davalsab S/o Chuchchusab Shalavadi,

Age : 70 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Goudra Oni, Near Chavadi,

Lakkundi Village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

2) Peerasab S/o Huchchusab Shalavadi,

Age : 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Goudra Oni, Near Chavadi,

Lakkundi Village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

3) Fakkirasab S/o Huchchusab Shalavadi,

Age : 49 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Goudra Oni, Near Chavadi,

Lakkundi Village, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in

LAC No. 60/2019

Subhasgouda S/o Ramanagouda Bhandi,

(Since deceased by his Lrs.)

1) Kusuma Subhasgouda Bhandi.

Age : 45 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

2) Puja D/o Subhasgouda Bhandi,

Age 21 years, Occ: Student,

R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

3) Pramodagouda S/o Subhasgouda

Bhandi, Age : 17 years, Occ: Student,

R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in

LAC No. 61/2019

Mariyappa S/o Mallappa Doni,

Age : 81 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Sambhapur, Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in

LAC No. 68/2019

Shivanagouda S/o Shankaragouda

Harlapur, Age : 50 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 69/2019

Basappa S/o Shankaragouda Harti,

Age : 60 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 70/2019

1) Mahadevappa S/o Shiddappa Hosamani,

Age : 22 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

2) Shiddappa S/o Mahadevappa Hosamani,

Age : 64 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village, Tq &

Dist : Gadag.

3) Shrikant S/o Shiddappa Hosamani,

Age : 16 years, Occ: Student, Since Minor

R/by his mother Guardian mother

Shivaputravva W/o Shiddappa Hosamani,

Age : 45 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 72/2019

Channappa S/o Mallappa Harti
Age : 52 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 73/2019

Revanappa Huchchappa Jadiyahavar,
Age : Major, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimants in
LAC No. 74/2019

- 1) Basavva W/o Yallappa Handi,
Age : 62 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.
- 2) Devakka W/o Parappa Hosalli,
Age : 57 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur Village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 75/2019

Shivaputrappa Huchchappa Jادیavar,
Age : Major, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 76/2019

Shivalingappa Amarappa Harti,
Age : 60 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 77/2019

Mallanagouda Parvatagouda Patil,
Age : 69 years, Occ: Agriculture,
R/o Adavisomapur village,
Tq & Dist : Gadag.

Claimant in
LAC No. 78/2019

Shanmukhappa Shidramappa Harti,
Age : 66 years, Occ: Agriculture,

R/o Adavisomapur village,

Tq & Dist : Gadag.

(By Sri S.K. Savadi, Adv.)

V/s.

Respondents : 1) The State of Karnataka,

Represented by Deputy
Commissioner, Gadag.

2) The Special Land Acquisition Officer,
Singatalur Lift Irrigation Scheme,
Huvinahadagali, Dist : Bellary.

3) The Executive Engineer,
Karnataka Neeravari Nigam Niyamit,
Singatalur Lift Irrigation Scheme,
Division, Huvinahadagali,
Sub Division Mundargi, Dist : Gadag.

(R 1 and 2 by Addl. Dist. Govt. Pleader,
R 3 By Sri. M.S. Sudi. Adv.)

- - -

COMMON JUDGMENT

These are the references made by the respondent No.2
Special Land Acquisition Officer, Singatalur Lift Irrigation
Scheme (hereinafter referred as 'SLAO') for acquiring lands

for Construction Singatalur Lift Irrigation Project and for construction of canals at Sambhapur village, Mundargi Taluk. Petitions u/s 64 of RFCTLARR Act, 2013 for enhancement of compensation with reference to the publishing preliminary notification in the Karnataka Gazette on 18.1.2016 are filed and the same get registered in the above LAC Numbers.

2. As these reference applications are arising out of the same preliminary notification in LAC Nos.19/2019 to 22/2019, 24/2019 to 32/2019, 34/2019 to 37/2019, 39/2019 to 56/2019, 58/2019 to 61/2019, 68/2019 to 70/2019, 72/2019 to 78/2019 and common evidence was recorded and taken up for common judgment.

Order 2 Rule 3 of CPC reads thus : Joinder of causes of action – 1) Save as otherwise provided, a plaintiff may unite in the same suit several causes of action against the same defendant, or the same defendants jointly; and any plaintiffs having causes of action in which they are jointly interested against the same defendant or the same defendants jointly may unite such causes of action in the same suit. 2) Where causes of action are united, the jurisdiction of the Court as

regards the suit shall depend on the amount or value of the aggregate subject-matters at the date of instituting the suit.

3. PARTICULARS OF LANDS ACQUIRED. Admittedly, the SLAO acquired the lands of the claimants particulars of which are as under:

LAC No.	Sy No.	Village	A - G	Wet or Dry as per the Award
19/2019	39/2B	Sambhapur	4acres 38 guntas	Agricultural land
20/2019	54/3	Sambhapur	22 guntas	Agricultural land
21/2019	23/2	Sambhapur	16 guntas	Agricultural land
22/2019	90/18	Sambhapur	1 acre 9 guntas	Agricultural land
24/2019	90/1A	Sambhapur	6 guntas	Agricultural land
25/2019	19/4	Sambhapur	18 guntas	Agricultural land`
26/2019	48/2	Sambhapur	15 guntas	Agricultural land
27/2019	21/2	Sambhapur	30 guntas	Agricultural land
28/2019	54/2	Sambhapur	3 acres 24 guntas	Agricultural land

29/2019	26	Sambha pur	3 acres 13 guntas	Agricultural land
30/2019	8/1B	Sambhap ur	10 guntas	Agricultural land
31/2019	8/1A	Sambhap ur	2 acres 5 guntas	Agricultural land
32/2019	90/2	Sambhap ur	2 acres 1 gunta	Agricultural land
34/2019	92/1+2/1	Sambhap ur	1 acre 30 guntas	Agricultural land
35/2019	75/1+2/C	Sambhap ur	1 acre	Agricultural land
36/2019	19/2	Sambhap ur	12 guntas	Agricultural land
37/2019	13/1A	Sambhap ur	1 acre 39 guntas	Agricultural land
39/2019	93/1	Sambhap ur	9 guntas	Agricultural land
40/2019	17/2	Papana shi	30 guntas	Agricultural land
41/2019	18/2 18/3 18/4	Papana shi	1 - 4 1-00 0-38	Agricultural land
42/2019	7/1+2/A	Papana shi	1 acre 16 guntas	Agricultural land
43/2019	7/1+2/C	Papana shi	23 guntas	Agricultural land

44/2019	7/3+4/A	Papana shi	1 acre	Agricultural land
45/2019	8/1A+4 (8/1A/4)	Papana shi	1 acre 18 guntas	Agricultural land
46/2019	2/2	Papana shi	9 guntas	Agricultural land
47/2019	3/1A	Papana shi	20 guntas	Agricultural land
48/2019	3/3	Papana shi	15 guntas	Agricultural land
49/2019	6/2A	Papana shi	1 acre 11 guntas	Agricultural land
50/2019	3/1B & (3/4)	Papana shi	5 guntas	Agricultural land
51/2019	8/1B/1	Papana shi	14 guntas	Agricultural land
52/2019	11/3B+3A+2	Papana shi	35 guntas	Agricultural land
53/2019	68/2A+2B+2C	Lakkundi	31 guntas	Agricultural land
54/2019	730/3	Lakkundi	29 guntas	Agricultural land
55/2019	730/1	Lakkundi	26 guntas	Agricultural land
56/2019	67/1A	Lakkundi	31 guntas	Agricultural land

58/2019	68/1	Lakkundi	1 acre 17 guntas	Agricultural land
59/2019	730/4	Lakkundi	23 guntas	Agricultural land
60/2019	68/3	Lakkundi	21 guntas	Agricultural land
61/2019	68/4	Lakkundi	1 acre 5 guntas	Agricultural land
68/2019	4/A/3	Adavi somapur	25 guntas	Agricultural land
69/2019	45/1+2+3+4+ 5/1B	Adavi somapur	30 guntas	Agricultural land
70/2019	44/2, 44/3 and 44/4	Adavi somapur	1 acre 22 guntas	Agricultural land
72/2019	45/1+2+3+4+ 5/7	Adavi somapur	32 guntas	Agricultural land
73/2019	162/6	Adavi somapur	5 guntas	Agricultural land
74/2019	5/4	Adavi somapur	10 guntas	Agricultural land
75/2019	162/5	Adavi somapur	27 guntas	Agricultural land
76/2019	45/1+2+3+4+ 5/6B	Adavi somapur	15 guntas	Agricultural land
77/2019	168/2	Adavi somapur	1 acre 1 gunta	Agricultural land

78/2019	45/1+2+3+4+ 5/1A	Adavi somapur	15 guntas	Agricultural land
---------	---------------------	------------------	-----------	----------------------

and awarded the compensation amount of Rs.5,97,640/- per acre for agricultural lands.

4. CONTENTIONS RAISED BY THE CLAIMANTS

Being aggrieved by the award passed by the SLAO, the claimants made protest applications u/s 64 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 for making references to the authority similarly contending that the S.L.A.O. has not issued any notice for hearing before passing of the award. The compensation awarded by the S.L.A.O. is too low when compared to the present market value of the lands. Value of the acquired lands are more than Rs.5,97,690/- per acre. The claimants were getting annual income of more than Rs.2,00,000/ per acre per year after deducting cost of cultivation. The acquired lands are NA Potential Lands. The acquired lands are very fertile land consisting rich red fertile soil. So they prayed to allow the applications.

5. STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS OF THE
RESPONDENTS

In pursuance of notice, the respondent No.1 appeared through the advocate and filed objections to the applications by denying the contents of reference applications. Further it is contended that the applications of the claimants U/s. 64 of the RTCTLAR. Act is barred by limitation. The claim made by the petitioners are not at all tenable in the eye of law and the same are not maintainable under the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act and hence it is liable to be dismissed. The grounds averred U/sec.64 of RECTLARR Act 2013 are not at all correct. It is absolutely false to allege that award passed by the SLAO Singalatur is not in accordance with law and SLAO awarded low market value as compared to the present market value of the acquired land. It is false to allege that the acquired land value is Rs.5,97,640/- per acre. The crop mentioned in the petitions are not at all correct and it is false to allege that they had income Rs.2,00,000/-P.A. out of acquired land.

5. 1). It is further stated that it is false to allege that the respondent No.2, SLAO have not considered the relevant

provisions of the RECTLARR 2013, at the time of passing of the award and the classification of the land made by the SLAO is incorrect. In fact the SLAO has considered its situation and with reference to location of land and as such awarded adequate compensation in the eye of law. The SLAO have proceeded to determine the valuation of the acquired lands U/s.21 (2) of RFCTLARR Act 2013. In pursuance of the notice, the claimants didn't file objections and the claimants have not produced any documentary evidence before the land acquisition officer in support of their claims. Hence, these petitions are liable to be dismissed.

5.2) It is further stated by the respondent No.1 that, keeping in view of its locations, present use and adjacent similar conditions of the acquired land, SLAO Sambhapur, Adavisomapur fixed compensation at the rate of Rs.5,97,560/- per acre under the first schedule U/sec.30(2) of RECTLARR Act 2013, on the basis of the sale price method. In fact the SLAO has considered all necessary conditions and location of the acquired lands at the time of spot inspection. That the SLAO while fixing the above market value has considered its special value and has chosen to fix

the highest best value on the sale price method shown in the award in preference to lowest sale price. The acquired land is purely agriculture land, and SLAO has awarded compensation properly in respect of structure, trees and other properties.

5.3) It is further stated by the 1st respondent that the Government of Karnataka for the purpose of providing irrigation facilities to the villagers, through its Executive Engineer Karnataka Neeravari Nigam Ltd, SLI project. After due compliance of the land value at Mundawada, Hammigi and Jalawadagi the SLAO have awarded adequate market value as contemplated under the provisions of RFCTLARR Act 2013. Hence, petitions are liable to be dismissed with the cost.

6. learned ADGP filed memo of appearance and statement of objections on behalf of the respondent No.1 and 2. Sum and substance of the objections raised by the respondent No.2 in addition to the objections filed by the respondent No.1 are that, the claim made by the petitioner is not at all tenable in the eye of law and same is not at all maintainable under the provisions of the RFCTLARR Act

2013. Hence it is liable to be dismissed. The grounds averred U/Sec. 64 of RFCTLARR Act 2013 petitions filed by the petitioners are not at all correct. It is absolutely false to allege that the award passed by the SLAO Hoovinahadagali is not in accordance with law and SLAO awarded low market value as compared to the present market value of the acquired lands. It is false to allege that the value of the acquired lands of the Rs. 12,75,665/- per acre. The crop mentioned in the petitions are not at all correct and it is false to allege that they have get (Yield) income of Rs. 2,00,000/- per annum out of acquired lands. It is false to allege that the respondent, SLAO have not considered the relevant provisions of the RFCTLARR-2013. At the time of passing of the award and the classification of the land made by the SLAO is incorrect. In fact the SLAO has considered its situation and with reference to its location of lands and as such awarded adequate compensation in the eye of law.

6.1) The SLAO have proceeded to determine the valuation of the acquired land U/Sec. 21(2) of RFCTLARR Act 2013. In pursuance of the notice, claimants have not filed their objections and the claimants have not produced any

documentary evidence before the land acquisition officer in support of their claims. Hence, these petitions are liable to be dismissed. However, in spite of keeping in view of its locations and its present use and adjacent similar conditions of the acquired lands, SLAO Hoovinahadagali fixed the compensation under the first schedule U/S 30(2) of RFCTLARR Act 2013, on the basis of the sale price method. Infact the SLAO has considered all necessary conditions and location of the acquired lands at the time of spot inspection. The SLAO while fixing the above market value has considered its special value and has chosen to fix the highest best value on the sale price method shown in the award in preference to lowest sale price. The acquired land is purely agriculture land, and SLAO has awarded compensation properly in respect of structure, trees and other properties. The Government of Karnataka for the purpose of providing the Irrigation facilities to the villagers through its Executive Engineer Karnataka Neeravari Nigam Ltd., have taken up SLI Project. After due compliance the SLAO Hoovinahadagali have awarded adequate market value as contemplated under the provisions of RFCTLARR Act 2013. Applications filed by the

petitioner U/s 64 of RFCTLARR Act 2013 are barred by limitation. Petitions are not filed U/S 64(2)(a) (b) within the stipulated time prescribed by the RFCTLARR Act 2013. Hence, it is liable to be dismissed with costs.

6.2. The applicants has not made definite claim before the SLAO. The compensation claimed by the claimants, without any basis and are highly exaggerated, excessive and calculated without any basis and is unfound in law. There is no reasonable grounds to enhance compensation and they are not entitled for the enhancement of compensation. The land acquisition officer has taken into consideration value of the proprietary rights of the claimants that they are loosing their lands once for the welfare of others and nation, future capabilities and present use of the land, yearly yield of the land, value for its similar neighbouring use for similar purpose. Accordingly SLAO has fixed the market value in accordance with RFCTLARR Act 2013. Thus SLAO has considered all relevant provisions of the RFCTLARR Act 2013. The SLAO award is proper and adequate. Hence prayed to confirm the award passed by the SLAO Hoovinahadagali.

7. The claimant No.1 in LAC No. 19/2019. 29 and 42/2019, 45/2019, 46/2019, 49/2019 are examined themselves as PW1 to 5 and got marked Ex.P1 to 123. The respondents have examined one witness as R.W.1 and got marked 3 documents Ex.R1 to 3. Heard the arguments. Perused the records of the cases.

8. Based on rival contentions of the parties following points arise for my consideration which are as under:-

- (1) Whether the references made in this court is within time prescribed U/Sec. 64(1) & (2) of RFCTLARR Act 2013 ?
- (2) Whether the claimants prove that compensation award by Special LAO in respect of acquired lands is inadequate and unjust?
- (3) Whether the claimants are entitled for enhancement of compensation for their acquired lands from the date of preliminary notification ?
- (4) If yes, with what rate of amount?
- (5) What order?

9. My findings on the above points are as under:

Point No.1 to 3 : In the affirmative

Point No.4 : Rs.6,52,500/- (Six Lakhs Fifty Two
Thousand Five Hundred) Per acre.

Point No.4: As per final order,

for the following;

: **REASONS::**

10. **POINT No.1:** The respondents have taken contention in their objections that the reference applications are barred u/s 64 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, but they have not given any particulars in their objections that when the award notice was served on the claimants and when the claimants have filed reference applications before the SLAO.

Sri. M.S. Sudi Adv. for respondent No.3 submitted arguments stating that date of service of notice is 1.4.2016. Last date for filing petition U/Sec. 64 of the act is 15.5.2016. Petitions have been filed on 26.11.2016. i.e. after 193 days Sri. S.K. Savadi. Adv. for the petitioners submitted arguments stating that an I.A. U/Sec. 5 of Limitation Act is filed to condone delay in filing petitions for the reason that interruption for running the period of limitation due to lockdown to prevent Covid-19 pandemic.

10.1). As per Sec. 64 (2) (a) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 within 06 weeks of receipt of notice of award, the protest applications have to be filed by the claimants before the SLAO and as per the proviso of Sec. 64 (2) (b) of the RFCTLARR Act,

2013, if the SLAO satisfied that there is sufficient cause for not filing the reference applications then, within a further period of 1 year, they can refer the reference applications to the Authority. As per Sec. 64 (1) of the RFCTLARR Act, from the date of filing of protest applications within one month the Collector has to refer the same to the Authority and if within one month the Collector fails to refer the matter to the Authority then within one month the claimants have to make applications before the Collector to refer the matter to the Authority.

10.2). In this regard it would be proper to rely on the ruling reported in 2006 (3) Kar. L.J. 540 (DB), (C.R. Nagarajashetty v/s. The Special Land acquisition Officer) wherein it is held that a reference under section 18 of the Act is not an appeal against the award and the court cannot take into account the material relied on by the Land Acquisition Officer in his award unless the same material is produced and proved before the court.

10.3). Further it would be proper to rely on the ruling reported in 1999 (4) Kar.L.J. 372, wherein it is held that in the event the State had to allege that either

application under Section 18(1) or under 18(3) of the Act was time-barred, the burden had been on the State to show the date of service of notice under Section 12(2) on the claimant. The document in this regard must be in possession of the State and the Special Land Acquisition Officer i.e., the Deputy Commissioner. Why those documents were not produced when this plea was placed? No explanation has been offered and when no document was has been furnished and no date has been indicated, then adverse presumption may be drawn against the plea taken by the State i.e., if the document would have been favourable to the State, then the State would have definitely produced those documents showing the date of service of notice under Section 12(2) of the Act and it can be presumed the date of service if would have been indicated then from that date definitely claim would have been within time i.e., why the State Government has not produced the document before the Civil Court and no doubt therefore it can be said that plea raised by the State was frivolous. ”

10.4). In this regard, it would be proper to rely on the principles held in the ruling reported in 1999 (1) Kar Law Journal 539 (FB) (Hanamappa V/s. The Spl. Land

Acquisition Officer) that as per proviso to Sec. 64 (2) (b) RFCTLARR Act, 2013, if the SLAO referred the reference application to the Authority beyond 1 year, then also it is valid and it is not barred by the limitation.

10.5). As held in the above rulings though the evidence adduced by the respondent that itself cannot dispense from proving that the date of service of award notice on the claimants and the date on which the claimants filed protest applications before the SLAO except for the purpose of consideration on the point of undisputed facts. The SLAO has to prove the same by entering into the witness box and by producing the documents pertaining to the date of service of award notice on the claimants and the date on which claimants filed protest applications before him. On the basis of the documents referred in Ex.R.1 to 3 and the alleged seal of SLAO regarding the date on which the claimants said to have filed the reference applications before the SLAO cannot be treated as evidence until and unless the same material is produced and proved before the court and if the SLAO referred the reference applications to the court after 6 weeks and within a further period of 1 year, then also it is valid as

held by their Lordships in the above citations. Hence, adverse presumption has to be drawn that the applications are within time.

10.6). The claimants are rustic villagers and hence there may be some delay in filing the protest applications before the SLAO after receipt of award notice. If there is delay in submitting the reference applications to the Authority by the SLAO and for that the claimants cannot be made responsible. Hence while considering the period of limitation these points have to be kept in mind. So it has to be held that the reference applications are not barred by limitation and they are in time. Hence, point No.1 is answered in affirmative.

11. POINT NO.2 AND 3 :- Since both points are interconnected with each other, hence to avoid repetition of facts and evidence, they are taken together for common discussion.

11.1). The learned advocate appearing for the claimants submitted arguments stating that the SLAO has awarded the compensation which is meager and inadequate.

Under Ex.P22 -sale deed, one acre of land was sold for Rs.12,75,566/-.

11.2). The Learned DGP argued that as per Sec.26 of The RFCTLARR Act, 2013 the SLAO considered the S.R. value guidelines and the average of sale statistics of preceding three years of Sambhapur, Adavisomapur, Papanashi Village and awarded the highest compensation in between them which is fair and adequate and hence, the claimants are not entitle for any enhancement of compensation amount.

11.3). The Learned Advocate appearing for claimants filed the written arguments stating that this petition is referred U/Se.64 of Right of Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act 2013. and prayed for enhance the compensation amount to Rs. 2,00,000/- per gunta along with all statutory benefits, in the interest of justice and equity.

11.4) Sri.M.S. Sudi Adv. for respondent No.3 has relied upon 4 citations. Sum and substance of those rulings that the exemplar sale deeds are not reflective of true market value.

11.5) The claimants have sought for enhancement of compensation amount awarded by the SLAO on the grounds that the lands of claimants are having very rich red alluvial soil and they had irrigated facility from well and bore well. The acquired lands value is more than Rs.12,75,566/- per acre. The claimants were getting annual income more than Rs.2,00,000/ per acre per year after deducting cost of cultivation. The acquired lands are NA Potential Lands. The acquired lands are very fertile land consisting rich red fertile soil.

11.6). P.W.1 to 5 have filed their affidavits in lieu of examination in chief in which they have reiterated the averments made in the reference application and produced Ex.P1 to 123 documents. Learned ADGP and Sri. M.S. Sudi advocate for respondents have vehemently argued that P.W.1 to 5 had no authority to give evidence on behalf of remaining petitioners and hence enhancing award amount of all petitioners by relying upon the oral evidence adduced by P.W.1 to 5 only is not correct for the reasons that P.W.1 to 5 have not produced any letter of authority executed by other petitioners and they have no personal knowledge of the

nature and value of the acquired lands of the other petitioners.

11.7). Sec. 26 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 deals with the criteria to be adopted by the Collector/SLAO in assessing and determining the market value of acquired lands and the same has to be decided by the Authority as a Suit as per section 60 of the RFCTLARR ACT, 2013.

11.8). In this regard, it would be proper to rely on the ruling reported in **AIR 1988 SC P 62 (Chimanlal Hargovinddas Vs. SLAO, Poona, and another)** wherein it is held that, *A reference under section 18 of the Land Acquisition Act is not an appeal against the award and the Court cannot take into account the material relied upon by the Land Acquisition officer in his Award unless the same material is produced and proved before the Court. So also the Award of the Land Acquisition officer is not to be treated as a judgment of the trial Court open or exposed to challenge before the Court hearing the Reference. It is merely an offer made by the Land Acquisition officer and the material utilised by him for making his valuation cannot be utilised by the Court unless produced and proved before it. It is not the*

function of the Court to suit in appeal against the Award, approve or disapprove its reasoning, or correct its error or affirm, modify or reverse the conclusion reached by the Land Acquisition officer, as if it were an appellate court. The Court has to treat the reference as an original proceeding before it and determine the market value afresh on the basis of the material produced before it. The claimant is in the position of a plaintiff who has to show that the price offered for his land in the award is inadequate on the basis of the materials produced in the Court. Of course the materials placed and proved by the other side can also be taken into account for this purpose. Etc.

11.9). So the action taken by the Collector/SLAO as per Sec. 26 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, is merely an offer made by him, but the Authority can approve or disapprove his reasoning or correct its error or affirm, modify or reverse the conclusion reached by him as per Sec. 60 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 as a suit and in the LAC Proceedings the status of the claimant is that of a plaintiff.

12. It is established position of law that the market value has to be determined on the following four methods :

- (1) Capitalization of net income method,
- (2) Sales statistics method,
- (3) Opinion of experts
- (4) Following the judgment of courts

12.1). To determine as to whether the case of the petitioners to be decided by following what type of methods among the above said 4 recognized method for determination of the amount of compensation for acquisition of their lands is concerned, it is just and necessary to take into consideration the materials available on record. No legally acceptable materials are available on record to adopt the method of capitalization of net income. Only materials available on record are the sale deeds to determine the amount of compensation by following sales statistics method and judgments to adopt the method of following the judgment of courts.

12.2) So far as sales statics method is concerned even though Ex. P 22, 10, 11,12,13,14, 15 sale deeds have been produced by the petitioners, it is not safe enough to rely upon the sale consideration mentioned on one or two sale deeds to fix the value of compensation for the acquired land. Therefore,

as approved by the Hon'ble Apex Court following the judgment of courts in the event of availability of judgments in respect of fixation of award in respect of acquisition of land for the same purpose is a safest method.

13. In this case SLAO acquired lands for the construction of canals to provide irrigation facilities under Singatalur Lift Irrigation Project. An application U/sec. 64A of RFCTLARR Act came to be filed in LAC No. 295/2008. After trial by relying upon various judgments court passed judgment awarding enhanced compensation. Relying upon the said judgment, this court awarded compensation by adding escalation of 10% in respect of Hammagi, Adavisomapur of Mundargi taluk. Therefore, petitioners in these cases are also entitled for the same amount of compensation with 10% escalation along with benefits required to be paid in land RFCTLARR Act 2013.

14. Claimants have produced documents Ex.P1 to Ex.P 121. Most of them are the petitions filed by the claimants seeking enhancement of compensation and the identification proof of the claimants. There are no useful material either in their oral evidence or in the documentary

evidence to determine the quality of soil, potential, income arising out of their acquired lands. Therefore, this court constraint to follow the obiter dicta of the judgment passed in similar sets of the facts and circumstances. Therefore this court is of the considered opinion that under the facts and circumstances of the case on hand method of “following the judgment of courts seems more suitable and convenient.”

14.1). In this regard, it would be proper to rely upon the ruling reported in **ILR 2003 SUPREME COURT 4382**, wherein Hon'ble Supreme court of India has held that – *best method would be to look at the earlier judgments and awards and not sale instances. High Court cannot be faulted for having fixed compensation on the basis of earlier judgments*”

14.2). It could be proper to rely on the ruling reported in **ILR 2004 Karnataka 2371 (Spl. Land Acquisition Officer V/s. FAKIRAPPA MOOGABASAVAPPA AND OTHERS)**, wherein it is held that *“In the matters relating to land acquisition the judgment of a court in regard to similar lands or properties would be a relevant piece of evidence. It is to be noted that, an element of guesswork is inherent in most of*

the cases involving determination of the market value of the acquired land. The previous awards in respect of similarly situated lands is a safe guide for determination of compensation.”

14.3). In this regard it would be better to further rely upon the ruling reported in ***ILR 2003 Kar. 2336 (State of Karnataka by SLAO and others Vs. Mallappa and others)***, wherein it is held that uniform rate of compensation for all the acquired lands which are similarly situated to the adjoining villages cannot be faulted and on the basis of judgment and award made by the Court in similar other cases, the enhancement of compensation has to be made.

14.4). Therefore, in the light of the principles held in the rulings cited supra and in the background of producing of the documents by the claimants, the judgments and awards passed by the courts is the best method to determine the market value. In view of this, it is not necessary to go into the details of the documents produced by the claimants under other methods to determine the market value.

15). As per the explanation 3 of Sec. 26 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013, the Collector / SLAO has no authority to rely on the judgments of earlier occasion in the district to determine the market value of the land but this Authority has got ample powers to consider the judgments passed on earlier occasion in the district.

16). The SLAO has determined the market value as per Sec. 26 of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 which is only an offer as per the ruling reported in **AIR 1988 SC 62 (supra)**. In view of previous judgments, compensation awarded by the SLAO to the acquired lands per acre which is Rs. 5,97,640/- is inadequate. The respondents have denied the case of the claimants. Hence, relying on the above said decisions in LAC No. 295/ 2008, I am of the considered opinion that the enhanced market value of the acquired lands are Rs.6,52,500/- per acre which will be the just and fair compensation irrespective of type of lands. Calculation of the escalation based on the aforesaid compensation amount payable to the present petitioners is made as under :

1) Sy. No. of acquired land : Sy. No. 39/2B.

2) As per reference petition enhanced

compensation passed by the Prl. Sr. Civil Judge
and CJM, Gadag : Rs.3,00,000/- per acre.

3) Date of notification U/Sec. 4(1) : 18.1.2016

4) Date of notification U/Sec. 4(1) of LAC No.
295/2008 : 5.4.2004.

5) No. of days from preliminary notification till
present compensation : 11 years 9 months.

6) Calculation of 10% of escalation for
Rs.3,00,000/- for 11 year 9 months :
Rs.3,52,500/- .

Therefore escalation of 10% from the date of notification from
5.8.2004 till 18.1.2016 on Rs.3,00,000/- is Rs.3,52,500/-
(Rupees Three lakhs fifty Two Thousand Five hundred) per
acre. Claimants are entitle for enhanced compensation
amount to the extent of Rs.6,52,500/- per acre which is just
and reasonable for acquired lands. Hence, Point No.2 and 3
is answered in the Affirmative.

17. **POINT NO.4:** In view of the above findings on Point
No. 3 and 4, the claimants are entitle for enhanced

compensation amount of Rs.6,52,500/- per acre under the present notification.

17.1). In these petitions, petitioners have claimed damages for destruction of growing crops at the time of construction work of channal to the tune of Rs. 1,50,000/- (One lakh fifty thousand) to Rs. 2,00,000/- (two lakhs). Further the petitioners have claimed compensation for trees and plants standing on the land acquired by the SLAO. Further the petitioners have claimed compensation for loss of income of Rs. 1,50,000/- to 2,00,000/- annually by growing crop in the acquired lands. However, it is pertinent to note that apart from oral evidence adduced by the petitioners, no documentary evidence have been produced. RTC is also not produced showing any particular of growing crop on the acquired lands. Some of the petitioners have claimed compensation for the damages and loss caused to borewell and openwell digged in the acquired lands. As there are no material available to estimate the aforesaid loses, this court constraint to rely upon the particulars mentioned in the reference made by SLAO to determine the enhanced value of lands and damages caused to the petitioners due to

acquisition of their lands. In the reference only particulars of acquired lands are given.

17.2). The lands of the claimants situated far away from the urban area and hence, they are entitle for double the market value with multiplier factor in accordance with the I schedule and also for solatium at the rate of 100% of the market value u/s 30 (1) along with additional compensation at the rate of 12% PA on market value u/s 30 (3) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 which is awarded by the SLAO.

17.3). For the reasons and discussions made above, this court is of the opinion that the claimants are entitle for enhanced compensation in part which is Rs.6,52,500/- and entitle for the double the market value with multiplier factor in accordance with the I schedule and entitle for solatium at the rate of 100% of the market value u/s 30 (1) along with additional compensation at the rate of 12% PA on market value u/s 30 (3) of the RFCTLARR Act, 2013 and entitle for interest on enhanced compensation as per Sec. 72 and 80 of RFCTLARR Act, 2013 and also they are at liberty to claim damages, if any, from SLAO for the period from date of actual possession to date of preliminary notification through a

separate enquiry. Hence, Point No.4 is answered partly in the Affirmative.

18. **POINT NO.5:** In view of my findings on Point No.2 to 5, following order is made :

ORDER

The reference applications filed u/s 64 of RFCTLARR Act, 2013, are allowed.

The market value of the acquired lands are fixed at the rate of Rs.6,52,500/- per acre. Accordingly, the claimants are entitle for the compensation. The claimants are also entitle for double the market value with multiplier factor as per the first schedule to RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

The respondent authorities are also directed to pay solatium at the rate of 100% of the market value of acquired lands U/sec. 30(1) of RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

The claimants are also entitle for compensation towards the trees or structures, if any, in the acquired lands as per the Schedule I of RFCTLARR

Act, 2013, as per the final award passed by the respondent authority. The claimants are also entitle to additional compensation at the rate of 12% p.a. on market value U/sec. 30 (3) of RFCTLARR Act, 2013. The claimants are also entitle for interest on enhanced compensation as per Sec. 72 and 80 of RFCTLARR Act, 2013.

The claimants are also entitle for compensation for the market value of the acquired lands as fixed at Rs.6,52,500/- per acre included escalation at 10% per annum from the date of notification passed in 2016 till this order.

The amount, if any, already paid to the claimants, shall be deducted in the above said amount.

The respondents are given 3 months time to deposit the compensation/remaining compensation amount.

Draw awards accordingly.

The advocate fee is fixed at Rs 1,000/-(Rupees one thousand) for each case.

Keep the original judgment in LAC No. 19/2019

and copies thereof in LAC No.s 20/2019 to 22/2019,
24/2019 to 32/2019, 34/2019 to 37/2019, 39/2019 to
56/2019, 58/2019 to 61/2019, 68/2019 to 70/2019,
72/2019 to 78/2019.

(Dictated to the Judgment Writer , typed by her corrected and
pronounced by me in the open-court on this the 23rd day of
September, 2023)

(Rajeshwara S Shetty)
I ADDL. DIST. & SESSIONS JUDGE,

ANNEXURE

Witnesses examined on behalf of the claimant/s:

- PW1- Narayanappa Hanumappa Naganur.
- PW2- Mudakanagouda Venkanagouda Bhandi.
- PW3- Yamanurappa Shivappa Elager
- PW4- Chandrashekharappa S Hallikeri
- PW5- Manjunath Yallappa Jogin.

Witnesses examined on behalf of the respondent/s:

- RW1- Vinaykumar B.M. S/o Basavarajappa K.M.

Exhibits marked on behalf of the claimant/s:

- Ex.P1 : Reference application in LAC No. 19/2019
- Ex.P2 : SLAO Order
- Ex.P3 : Certified copy of award.
- Ex.P4: SLAO Tiluvalike patra.
- Ex.P5 to 8 : SLAO awards

Ex.P9 : C/c. of award of Deputy Commissioner

Ex.P10 to 24 : C/c. of sale deeds.

Ex.P25 : Right to information act information
to Advocate.

Ex.P 26,28,30,32,34,36,38,40,42,44,46,48,50,52,54,
56,58,60,62,64,66,68,70,72,74,76,78,80,82,84,86,
88,90,92,94,96,98,100,102,104,106,108,110,112,
114, 116, 118.120 : Reference applications.

Ex.P 27,29,31,33,35,37,39,41,43,45,47,49,51,53,55,
57,59,61,63,65,67,69,71,73,75,77,79,81,83,85,87,
89,91,93,95,97,99,101,103,105,107,109,111,113,
115,117,119,121 : Award notices.

Exhibits marked on behalf of the respondent/s:

Ex.R1 : Authorization letter
Ex.R2 : Price index
Ex.R3 : Certified copy of judgment
in LAC 86/2015.

(Rajeshwara S Shetty)
ADDL. DIST. & SESSIONS JUDGE, GADAG.

LAC No.s 19/19 to 22/19, 24 to 32/19, 34 to 37/19,
39 to 56/19, 58 to 61/19, 68 to 70/2019
& 72/19 to 78/19