

**IN THE COURT OF LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND  
RE-SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY, KOTTAYAM**

Present:- Sri.Subash S, Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and  
Re-settlement Authority, Kottayam

**Thursday, the 30<sup>th</sup> day of April 2026**  
**10<sup>th</sup> day of Vaisakha 1948**  
**LAR No. 85/2022 and LAR No. 89/2022**

**LAR No.85/2022**  
( Award 31/2022 LAC-29/KPLY)

**Claimant:**

Mr. Joseph George.K, S/o. K.K.George  
Kallarackal Anathanam House, Kanjirappally.

By Adv. Benny Jacob & Adv.Roy Jose

**Respondents:**

1. State of Kerala, Rep. By District Collector, Kottayam.
2. The Special Tahsildar, LA (General), Kottayam.
3. The Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation of Kerala Limited, Cochin, 682025.

R1 to R3 by Adv. Sri. Cyril Thomas, Addl. Govt. Pleader.

**LAR No.89/2022**  
Award No. 30/2022/LAC-28/KPLY

**Claimant:**

Kuruvilla George.K, S/o. K.K.George,  
Kallarackal Anathanam House, Kanjirappally.

By Adv. Benny Jacob & Adv. Roy Jose

**Respondents:**

1. State of Kerala, Rep. By District Collector, Kottayam.
2. The Special Tahsildar, LA (General), Kottayam.
3. The Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation of Kerala Limited, Cochin, 682025.

R1 to R3 by Adv. Sri. Cyril Thomas, Addl. Govt. Pleader.

These two reference application having been jointly tried and finally heard on 23.04.2026 and the court on 30.04.2026 answered the following:-

**COMMON AWARD**

The above two cases are based on the references made under S.64 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (hereinafter referred to as Act-2013). As per the order in IA No.1/2026 filed by the claimant in LAR No.85/2022, a joint trial of the cases was ordered, and evidence was adduced in LAR No.85/2022.

2. Brief facts leading to the reference in LAR No. 85/2022 are as follows:

As per the requisition of the Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation of Kerala Ltd, Cochin, an extent of 17.55 ares of land comprised in Sy. No.265/4-1, Block No.11 of Kanjirappally Village, which belongs to the claimant, was acquired for the construction of the Kanjirappally bypass. The Land Acquisition Officer included the said land in the C category and awarded a compensation of ₹1,15,78,149/- to the claimant. Notification as per S.4(1) of the Act was published on 11.05.2017. Thereafter, a preliminary notification under S.11(1) of the Act was published on 04.12.2019. The award was passed on 19.02.2022, and the possession of land was taken on 11.05.2022.

3. Brief facts leading to the reference in LAR No. 89/2022 are as follows:

As per the requisition of the Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation of Kerala Ltd, Cochin, an extent of 4.73 ares of land comprised in Sy. No.265/3-1, Block No.11 of Kanjirappally Village, which belongs to the claimants, was acquired for the construction of Kanjirappally Bypass. The Land Acquisition Officer included the said land in the C

category and awarded a compensation of ₹31,20,493/- to the claimants. Notification as per S.4(1) of the Act was published on 11.05.2017. Thereafter, a preliminary notification under S.11(1) of the Act was published on 04.12.2019. The award was passed on 19.02.2022, and the possession of land was taken on 11.05.2022.

4. Being aggrieved by the awards, the claimants preferred reference applications under Section 64 of The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013, and based on which, the District Collector made the above references.

5. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is the State of Kerala, represented by the District Collector, Kottayam. The 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is the Special Tahasildar, Land Acquisition (General), Kottayam and the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent is the Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation of Kerala Ltd, Kochi.

6. Notices were issued to the respondents and claimants, and all parties appeared before this Authority.

7. The claimants filed statements in all the above cases contending that the acquired lands are situated in Kanjirappally town very near to National Highway 183. The distance from the above lands to the high way is hardly 100 metres. Schools, hospitals, hill stations, police station, bus stand, market, church, temple, mosque etc are situated at a walking distance from the said properties. The location of the acquired lands is a prime residential area. Considering the lie and location, the acquired lands are having high potential value and commercial importance. The said properties have easy access from Kurishukavala and Petta kavala in Kanjirappally town and from NH 183. Similar properties situated within 1 km radius were transferred for more than ₹12,00,000/- per cent during the relevant period. The acquired lands are having market value of more than ₹15,00,000/- per cent. The acquisition of land has caused severe inconvenience for the use of remaining land due to the loss of access from the road. The actual area of the acquired land in LAR No.85/2022 is 17.90 ares, but the area mentioned in the notice and award is only 17.55 ares. The claimant in LAR No.85/2022 is entitled to get

compensation for 17.90 ares based on the actual measurement and calculation. The actual area of acquired land in LAR No.89/2022 is 5.56 ares, but the area mentioned in the notice and award is only 4.73 ares. Hence the claimant in LAR No.89/2022 is entitled to get compensation for 5.56 ares based on the actual measurement and calculation.

8. 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents filed objection in LAR No.85/2022 contending as follows;

The Land Acquisition Officer fixed the land value at the rate of ₹1,95,530/- per are based on sale deed Nos.1119/2019, 428/2017, 1269/2018, 1957/2019 and 1389/2018 of Kanjirappally SRO. After considering the market value of the land that prevailed in the locality at the time of preliminary notification under section 11(1) of the Act. Award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer is just and based on proper enquiry. The claimant is not entitled to get additional compensation.

9. From the side of claimant, AW1 was examined and Ext.A1 to A5 were marked. Commissioner's report and plan were marked as Exts.C1 and C1(a). No evidence was adduced

from the side of the respondents.

10. Heard both sides.

11. The points for consideration are:-

1. Does the market value fixed by the collector warrant any interference by the Authority? If so, what shall be the market value of the acquired lands?
2. Is the claimant in LAR No.85/2022 entitled to enhanced compensation as prayed for, and if so, what shall be the quantum of compensation?
3. Are the claimants in LAR No.89/2022 entitled to enhanced compensation as prayed for, and if so, what shall be the quantum of compensation?
4. Reliefs and costs?

12. **Point No.1:-** The Land Acquisition Officer fixed the market value of the acquired land at ₹1,95,530/- per are. According to the claimants, the land value fixed by the Land Acquisition Officer is grossly inadequate, and the said land would fetch ₹15,00,000/-per cent. To establish the market value of the land, the claimant produced Exts.A1 to A4 sale deeds and Ext.A5 award. Ext.A5 is the certified copy of the common award in LAR Nos. 88/2022 and LAR 86/2022, which arose out of the same acquisition. As per the said award, this authority fixed the

market value of the acquired land comprised in survey No.96/9-5 and 96/9-5-2 at ₹7,24,017/- per are based on the sale deed No.4248/2011 of Kanjirappally Sub Registrar Office. Learned counsel for the claimant submitted that the order of the reference court in respect of an acquisition in the same village can be considered for the purpose of calculating the market value.

13. S.26 of the Act 2013 provides for the criteria for assessing and determining the market value of the land by the Collector. S.26 read as follows:

26. Determination of market value of land by Collector.

(1) The Collector shall adopt the following criteria in assessing and determining the market value of the land, namely:-

(a) the market value, if any, specified in the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) for the registration of sale deeds or agreements to sell, as the case may be, in the area, where the land is situated; or

(b) the average sale price for similar type of land situated in the nearest village or nearest vicinity area; or

(c) consented amount of compensation as agreed upon under sub-section (2) of section 2 in case of acquisition of lands for private companies or for

public private partnership projects, whichever is higher: Provided that the date for determination of market value shall be the date on which the notification has been issued under section II.

Explanation 1. - The average sale price referred to in clause (b) shall be determined taking into account the sale deeds or the agreements to sell registered for similar type of area in the near village or near vicinity area during immediately preceding three years of the year in which such acquisition of land is proposed to be made.

Explanation 2. - For determining the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1, one-half of the total number of sale deeds or the agreements to sell in which the highest sale price has been mentioned shall be taken into account.

Explanation 3. - While determining the market value under this section and the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1 or Explanation 2, any price paid as compensation for land acquired under the provisions of this Act on an earlier occasion in the district shall not be taken into consideration.

Explanation 4. - While determining the market value under this section and the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1 or Explanation 2, any price paid, which in the opinion of the Collector is not indicative of actual prevailing market value may be discounted for the purposes of calculating market value.

(2) The market value calculated as per sub-section (1) shall be multiplied by a factor to be specified in the First Schedule.

(3) Where the market value under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) cannot be determined for the reason that -

(a) the land is situated in such area where the transactions in land are restricted by or under any other law for the time being in force in that area; or

(b) the registered sale deeds or agreements to sell as mentioned in clause (a) of sub-section (1) for similar land are not available for the immediately preceding three years; or

(c) the market value has not been specified under the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899) by the appropriate authority, the State Government concerned shall specify the floor price or minimum price per unit area of the said land based on the price calculated in the manner specified in sub-section (1) in respect of similar types of land situated in the immediate adjoining areas:

Provided that in a case where the Requiring Body offers its shares to the owners of the lands (whose lands have been acquired) as a part compensation, for acquisition of land, such shares in no case shall exceed twenty-five per cent. of the value so calculated under sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) or sub-section (3) as the case may be:

Provided further that the Requiring Body shall in no case compel any owner of the land (whose land has been acquired) to take its shares, the value of which is deductible in the value of the land calculated under sub-section (1):

Provided also that the Collector shall, before initiation of

any land acquisition proceedings in any area, take all necessary steps to revise and update the market value of the land on the basis of the prevalent market rate in that area:

Provided also that the appropriate Government shall ensure that the market value determined for acquisition of any land or property of an educational institution established and administered by a religious or linguistic minority shall be such as would not restrict or abrogate the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice.

14. As per Explanation 1 of S.26(1)(b), the average sale price referred to in clause (b) shall be determined taking into account the sale deeds or the agreements to sell registered for similar type of area in the near village or near vicinity area during immediately preceding three years of the year in which such acquisition of land is proposed to be made. As per Explanation 3, while determining the market value and the average sale price referred to in Explanation 1 or Explanation 2, any price paid as compensation for land acquired under the provisions of this Act on an earlier occasion in the district shall not be taken into consideration. In the present case, to determine the market value of the acquired land, the claimant has produced Ext.A5 award of this Authority in similar

references. In this context, it is useful to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court in K.C. Aleyas S/o Cherian Vs State of Kerala (2025 (1) KLT 747). In the said case, the Hon'ble High Court considered the impact of the restrictions imposed by Explanation 1 and 3 to S.26(1) (b) of the Act 2013 and observed as follows:

“A reading of Explanation 3 shows that what is prohibited is placing reliance on the compensation granted under the Act in similar case while determining the market value. The component of compensation provided under the Act includes solatium and interest. However, read as may be, we are not able to find out any restriction created by the statute in relying on the market value fixed by the reference court under the erstwhile Land Acquisition Act 1894. Still further the word used is “amount paid as compensation” ( emphasis supplied) and not the market value of the land. The word ‘compensation’ mentioned in Explanation 3 to Section 26(1) must be construed in the light of Section 27 and Section 28 of the Act. A reading of Section 28 shows that the Collector, in determining the compensation must take into account various components required by the Statute. Pertinently, the market value is only one of the components of the compensation. When the entire scheme of Sections 26 and 28 is examined, it becomes evident that compensation determined under Section 27 includes multiple factors mentioned under Section 28, and therefore the parliament wanted to exclude the same and hence Explanation 3 was inserted. To read Explanation 3 to Section 26(1)(b) of the Act as

one prohibiting the court to take into consideration the market value fixed by the reference court or High Court in respect of an acquisition in the same village at an earlier point of time would certainly amount to adding words into the statute, which is impermissible, going by settled principles governing Interpretation of Statute.”

15. In the said case, the Hon’ble High Court held as follows:

“30. Thus, the following points emerge out of a cumulative reading of the aforesaid precedents:

a. The order of the reference court in respect of an acquisition in the same village can be considered for the purpose of calculating the market value.

b. Exemplars beyond nine years can also be taken for consideration, provided the escalation prices are cautiously applied.”

16. So, as held by the Hon’ble High Court in the above case, the order of the reference court in respect of an acquisition in the same village can be considered for the purpose of calculating the market value. Ext.A5 award was passed in LAR Nos. 86/2022 and 88/2022, which arose out of the acquisition in the same notification. In LAR Nos. 86/2022 and 88/2022, the land comprised in survey Nos. 96/9-5 and

96/9-2 in block No.11 of Kanjirappally village, was acquired for the construction of Kanjirappally bypass as per the requisition of the Manager, Roads and Bridges Development Corporation, Kerala Ltd., Cochin. In the present cases, the acquired lands are comprised in survey Nos. 265/4-1 and 265/3-1 in block No. 11 of Kanjirappally Village, and the same were also acquired for the construction of the Kanjirappally bypass as per the same notification. It is reported by the Commissioner that the acquired land in LAR 89/2022 is situated at a distance of 300 meters from Kurisukavala in Kanjirappally Town, 800 meters from Pettakavala, 1km from the Bus stand, Panchayath office, Hotel Elegance, and St.Dominic's HSS, Kanjirappally, 600 meters from the Post Office and Town hall, 750 meters from the Mini Civil Station and Police Station, 1.5 km from St.Mary's Church (Akkarapally) and Mosque, 1.4 km from St.Dominic's Cathedral, Kanjirappally. Even though the commissioner was deputed in LAR 89/2022, and he submitted Ext.C1 report regarding the acquired land in LAR 89/2022, as per the said report, the property of the claimant in LAR 85/22 is situated on the eastern side of the acquired land in LAR 89/22.

17. This Authority fixed the market value of the acquired land in LAR Nos. 86/2022 and 88/2022, relying upon the sale deed No. 4248/2011 of Kanjirappally Sub Registrar's office. The claimants herein have produced the certified copy of the said sale deed, and the same was marked as Ext.A1. As per Ext.C1 report, the acquired land in LAR 89/2022 is situated at a distance of 300 m from the property covered by Ext.A1 sale deed. Ext. C1 report would show further that the acquired property in LAR 89/22 is situated at a distance of 100 meters from K.K road, and the said property has access to K.K road through a private road having a width of 4 meters. The property covered by Ext.A1 sale deed also has private road access only. Therefore, Ext.A5 award can be taken into consideration for determining the market value of the acquired land. The claimants have also produced Ext.A2 to A4 sale deeds for the determination of market value. As per Ext.C1 report, the property covered by Ext.A2 is situated at a distance of 20 meters from the K.K road. The acquired lands in the present references are situated at a distance of 100 meters from the K.K. road. Hence, it cannot be said that the property covered by

Ext.A2 sale deed is similar to the acquired lands herein. It is reported by the commissioner that he couldn't identify the properties covered by Ext.A3 and A4 sale deeds. Therefore, Ext.A2 to A4 sale deeds cannot be taken into consideration for fixing the market value of the acquired lands in the present references.

18. Now, the question to be considered is, in the absence of other exemplars, can Ext.A5 alone be taken into consideration for fixing the market value. It is pertinent to note that the criteria provided in S.26 of the Act are for the Collector to follow in determining the market value of the land acquired. As per S. 69 (1) of The RFCTLARR Act, 2013, in determining the amount of compensation to be awarded for land acquired, including the rehabilitation and resettlement entitlements, the Authority shall take into consideration whether the Collector has followed the parameters set out under sections 26 to 30 and the provisions under Chapter V of this Act. Even though the Land Acquisition Officer relied upon sale deed Nos.1119/2019 dated 29.05.2019, 428/2017 dated 07.03.2017, 1269/2018 dated 18.06.2018, 1957/2019 dated 27.09.2019 and

1389/2018 dated 04.07.2018 of Kanjirappally Sub Registrar Office, for fixing the market value of the acquired properties, the respondents neither produced those deeds nor adduced any material to show that the properties covered by the aforesaid sale deeds are similarly situated lands. There is no other document to take the average sale price of similar types of land situated in the nearest village or vicinity. If the said award is not taken into consideration for determining the market value of the acquired properties on the sole ground that there are no other exemplars for taking the average sale price, it will seriously affect the right of the claimant in getting just and fair compensation for his acquired land. In the case of Aleyas (supra), the Hon'ble High Court observed that the courts can always step in to obliterate the difficulties faced by the landowners when faced with the land acquisition, though such interference should be within the permissible limit. So, I am of the considered opinion that in the absence of other exemplars, Ext.A5 award passed by this Authority in similar references can be taken into consideration for fixing the market value of the acquired land. As per Ext.A5, this Authority fixed the market

value of land at ₹7,24,017/- per are. So, ₹7,24,017/- per are can be taken as the market value of the land acquired in the present case. The above point is answered accordingly.

19. **Point No.2:-** In LAR No.85/2022, an extent of 0.1755 hectare of land was acquired and awarded a compensation of ₹1,15,78,149/- to the claimant. Admittedly, the said land belongs to the claimant. Even though the claimant contended that the actual area acquired and taken possession by the respondents is 17.90 ares, there is no material before the court to show that the actual area of the acquired land is 17.90 ares. So, the claimant is not entitled to get compensation for 17.90 ares. By applying the market value of the land at ₹7,24,017/- per are, the market value of 17.55 ares of land would come to ₹1,27,06,498.35 (7,24,017 x 17.55). When the said amount is multiplied by the factor 1.4, the market value would come to ₹1,77,89,097.69. By virtue of S.69(3), the Authority shall, in every case, award a solatium of 100% of the total compensation. It is well settled that the solatium as contemplated under sub-section (1) of Section 30 of the 2013 Act has to be calculated only on the market value plus the value

of the assets attached to the land. Claimant has not adduced any material to show that there is any structure or other assets in the acquired land. So, the market value of land can be taken for awarding solatium. 100% solatium amounts to ₹1,77,89,097.69. By virtue of S.69(2) of the Act, in addition to the market value of the land, as above provided, the Authority shall in every case award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve percent, per annum on such market value for the period commencing on and from the date of the publication of the preliminary notification under section 11 in respect of such land to the date of the award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier. The preliminary notification under S.11(1) of the Act was published on 04.12.2019. The award was passed on 19.02.2022, and the possession of land was taken on 11.05.2022. Therefore, 12% per annum on ₹1,77,89,097.69 from 04.12.2019 to 19.02.2022 (808 days) is ₹47,25,564.14. The Collector has not awarded any amount under the head of rehabilitation and resettlement benefits, and the claimant has no case that he is entitled to get compensation under the head of rehabilitation and resettlement

benefits. Although the claimant contended that, due to the acquisition of the aforesaid extent of land, the remaining property of the claimant was injuriously affected, there is no material before the Authority to substantiate such a claim. So, the total compensation to be awarded is as follows:

Value of the land	- ₹1,27,06,498.35 (7,24,017 x 17.55)
Value of land after multiplying by factor 1.4	- ₹1,77,89,097.69
Value of the house or other immovable property	- Nil
100% Solatium	- ₹1,77,89,097.69
12% of the market value from 04.12.2019 to 19.02.2022 (808 days)	- ₹47,25,564.14
<b>Total</b>	<b>- ₹4,03,03,759.52</b>

20. The claimant received an amount of ₹1,15,78,149/- as per the award of the Collector. So, he is entitled to ₹2,87,25,610.52 as additional compensation.

21. **Point No.3:-** In LAR No.89/2022, an extent of 0.0473 hectare of land was acquired and awarded a compensation of ₹31,20,493/- to the claimant. Admittedly, the

said land belongs to the claimant. The claimant contended that the actual area acquired and taken possession by the respondents is 5.56 ares, but the area mentioned in the award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer is 4.73 ares. The commissioner with the assistance of a surveyor deputed by this Authority measured out the remaining property of the claimant and the acquired land and submitted Ext.C1 report and C1(a) plan. The acquired land is shown in Ext.C1(a) plan by using letters 'ABCK' and the total extent of the acquired land is 5.28 ares. The respondents did not raise any objection to Ext.C1 report and C1(a) plan. Hence the claimant is entitled to get compensation for 5.28 ares of land. By applying the market value of the land at ₹7,24,017/- per are, the market value of 5.28 ares of land would come to ₹38,22,809.76 (7,24,017 x 5.28). When the said amount is multiplied by the factor 1.4, the market value would come to ₹53,51,933.66. By virtue of S.69(3), the Authority shall, in every case, award a solatium of 100% of the total compensation. Claimant has not adduced any material to show that there is any structure or other assets in the acquired land. So, the market value of land can be taken for

awarding solatium. 100% solatium amounts to ₹53,51,933.66. By virtue of S.69(2) of the Act, in addition to the market value of the land, as above provided, the Authority shall in every case award an amount calculated at the rate of twelve percent, per annum on such market value for the period commencing on and from the date of the publication of the preliminary notification under section 11 in respect of such land to the date of the award of the Collector or the date of taking possession of the land, whichever is earlier. The preliminary notification under S.11(1) of the Act was published on 04.12.2019. The award was passed on 19.02.2022 and the possession of land was taken on 11.05.2022. Therefore, 12% per annum on ₹53,51,933.66 from 04.12.2019 to 19.02.2022 (808 days) is ₹14,21,708.18. The Collector has not awarded any amount under the head of rehabilitation and resettlement benefits, and the claimant has no case that he is entitled to get compensation under the head of rehabilitation and resettlement benefits.

22. The learned counsel for the claimant contended that the acquisition has injuriously affected the remaining property of the claimant. As per Ext.C1 report submitted by

the commissioner, the bypass road was constructed at a level 3 mtr higher than the level of the remaining property of the claimant and in order to strengthen the road, dry rock wall was constructed on either side of the road. It is also reported by the commissioner that, due to the improper laying of drainage pipe under the road, the water stagnates in the remaining property of the claimant, resulting in the accumulation of the soil and mud therein. It is pertinent to note that the property of the claimant is situated 100 mtre away from NH 183 and by the construction of bypass road through the southern side of the said property, there is likely to be an increase in the market value of the remaining property of the claimant. So, the contention of the claimant that due to the acquisition of the portion of his property, the value of his remaining property has been substantially diminished cannot be accepted. However, it is reported by the commissioner that due to the improper laying of the drainage pipe, water stagnates in the remaining property of the claimant resulting in the accumulation of the soil and mud therein, which has substantially affected the beneficial enjoyment of the said property. In the circumstances, it is just

and reasonable to award ₹1,00,000/- to the claimant for providing and maintaining proper drainage facilities in the said property.

So, the total compensation to be awarded is as follows:

Value of the land	- ₹38,22,809.76 (7,24,017 x 5.28)
Value of land after multiplying by factor 1.4	- ₹53,51,933.66
Value of the house or other immovable property	- Nil
100% Solatium	- ₹53,51,933.66
12% of the market value from 04.12.2019 to 19.02.2022 (808 days)	- ₹14,21,708.18
Compensation for damage sustained by the claimant due to acquisition	- ₹1,00,000
<b>Total</b>	- ₹1,22,25,575.5

23. The claimant received an amount of ₹31,20,493/- as per the award of the Collector. So, he is entitled to ₹91,05,082.5 as additional compensation.

24. **Point No.7:-** In the result,

LAR No.85/2022 is answered in favour of the claimant as follows:-

- (a) The claimant is entitled to enhanced compensation of ₹2,87,25,611/- (Rupees two Crore eighty seven Lakh twenty five thousand six hundred and eleven only).

- (b) The claimant is entitled to get 9% interest per annum on the amount for a period of one year from 11.05.2022, the date of possession and thereafter @ 15% per annum till the amount is actually paid/deposited before the authority.
- (c) The claimant is entitled to get proportionate costs.

LAR No.89/2022 is answered in favour of the claimants

as follows:-

- (a) The claimant is entitled to enhanced compensation of ₹91,05,083/- (Rupees ninety one lakh five thousand and eighty three only).
- (b) The claimant is entitled to get 9% interest per annum on the amount for a period of one year from 11.05.2022, the date of possession and thereafter @ 15% per annum till the amount is actually paid/deposited before the authority.
- (c) The claimant is entitled to get proportionate costs.

*Dictated to the Confdl. Asst. transcribed and typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me in open court on this the 30<sup>th</sup> day of Aprii, 2026.*

**Sd/-**  
**Subash.S,**  
**Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation**  
**and Re-Settlement Authority**

**APPENDIX:****Exhibits Marked for the Claimants**

Ext. A1	18.10.2011	True copy of sale deed No.4248/1/2011 of Kanjirappally SRO
Ext.A2	12.12.2011	True Copy of sale deed No. 5010/1/2011 of Kanjirappally SRO
Ext.A3	04.06.2015	True copy of sale deed No.1071/1/2015 of Kanjirappally SRO
Ext.A4	04.09.2015	True copy of sale deed No.1683/1/2015 of Kanjirappally SRO
Ext.A5	29.11.2025	Certified copy of award in LAR No.86/2022 and LAR 88/2022 of LARR Authority Kottayam.

**Exhibits Marked for the Respondent: NIL.****Court Exhibits:**

Ext.C1	17.02.2026	Commission report filed by Advocate Commissioner Steby Mathew
Ext.C1(a)	17.02.2026	Survey Plan prepared by Surveyor Premkumar.B.

**Witness Examined for Claimant:**

AW1                      26.03.2026      Joseph George.K.

**Witness Examined for the Respondent: NIL****Court Witness: NIL.**

Id/-  
Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation  
and Re-Settlement Authority

Copied by:  
Compared by:

//True Copy//

Sd/-  
Subash.S,  
Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation  
and Re-Settlement Authority

<b><u>STATEMENT AS PER O.M.No.D1-60482/1996 DATED 14-01-1997</u></b> <b><u>OF THE HONOURABLE HIGH COURT OF KERALA.</u></b> <b><u>LAND ACQUISITION, REHABILITATION AND</u></b> <b><u>RE-SETTLEMENT AUTHORITY, KOTTAYAM.</u></b>		
<b><u>L.A.R. No.89/2022</u></b>		
a)	Purpose of acquisition :	For the construction of Kanjirappally By pass.
b)	Date of notification either under section 3(1) or 4(1) of the act as the case may be	11.05.2017
c)	Date on which possession was taken	11.05.2022
d)	Date of award, compensation awarded by the Land Acquisition	19.02.2022
i.	Land Value of 35.48 Are @ ₹1,95,530/- per Are.	₹9,24,856.90
ii	Factor by which Land value multiplied	1.4
iii.	Value of improvements	NIL
	1. Trees: NIL	
	2. Structures: NIL	
iv	Market Value of land	₹12,94,799.66
v	100% Solatium on Market Value of land	₹12,94,799.66
vi.	Additional enhancement value @ 12% per annum for (I) of under section 30(3) of LAAR Act 2013 for the period of 1746 days from 11.05.2017 to 19.02.2022	₹5,30,893.19
vii.	Total	₹31,20,492.51
viii.	Rehabilitation and Resettlement amount grand (Rounded to)	Nil
ix.	Grand Total (Rounded to)	₹31,20,493.00
e.	Whether the court has enhanced the compensation or Not	Enhanced the compensation

<b>Copy of Common Award in LAR No 89/2022 Dated: 30.04.2026</b>	
f. Whether the court has enhanced compensation, the relevant break up figures, including the centage	Enhanced the compensation.
i. Land value fix @ 5.28 Ares X 1.4 X ₹ 7.24.017 per Are ) LARR Authority.	₹53,51,933.66
ii Value of improvements	NIL
1. Trees:NIL	
2. Structures:NIL	
iii Total Land Value	₹53,51,933.66
iv. 100% of solatium of ₹53,51,933.66	₹53,51,933.66
v 12% of ₹53,51,933.66 ( For the period from 04.12.2019 to 19.02.2022, 808 days)	₹14,21,708.18
vi. Rehabilitation Amount	₹1,00,000/-
<b>Total</b>	<b>₹1,22,25,575.50</b>
<b>Enhanced compensation</b> (₹1,22,25,575.50 - ₹31,20,493.00)	<b>₹91,05,082.50</b>
The Claimant is entitled to get enhanced compensation of <b>₹91,05,083/-</b> with interest at 9% per annum for one year from 11.05.2022 and thereafter at 15% per annum till the deposit is made.	

**Id/-  
Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation  
and Re-Settlement Authority**