

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
F.A. No. 152 of 2018

- 1. Kartik Bedia (Aged about 37 years)
S/O Late Sukar Bedia
- 2. Chandra @ Chandu Bedia (Aged about 35 years)
S/o of Late Parna Bedia
- 3. Mostt. Shanichriya Devi, w/o Late Shivcharan (**substituted vide order dated 10.10.2025**)
- 3(a) Sabita Kumari (aged 23 years)
- 3(b) Poonam Kumari (aged 18 years)
- Both daughters of Late Shivcharan Bedia
- 4. Jarku Bedia, son of Late Tubki (aged 55 years)
All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S. Patratu, P.O.- Barkakana, Dist- Ramgarh.

... ... **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

- 1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS- Ramgarh, Dist.- Ramgarh
- 2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O- Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.

... ... **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 154 of 2018

- 1. Balku Bedia (Aged about 30 years)
- 2. Jitu Bedia (Aged about 25 years)
Both grandsons of Late. Sukhlal Mahto
{sons of Late Bhima Bedia}
Both residents of Village- Kadru, P.S- Patratu, P.O- Naya Nagar,
Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.

... ... **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

- 1. State of Jharkhand, through Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS- Ramgarh, Dist-Ramgarh.
- 2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O- Barkakana P.S-Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.

... ... **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

- 3. Arjun Bedia
Grandson of Late Sukhlal Mahto
(Son of Late Kishun Bedia)
- 4. Prayag Bedia
Grandson of Late Sukhlal Mahto
(Son of Late Khema Mahto)
- 3 and 4 residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S. Patratu, P.O.- Naya Nagar, Barkakana, Dist- Ramgarh.

... ... **Petitioners/Awardees/Performa Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 156 of 2018

1. Most. Rathiya Devi (Aged about 63 years)
W/o late Bandhan Bedia
 2. Asharam Bedia (Aged about 47 years)
 3. Jairam Bedia (Aged about 43 years)
Both S/o Late Bandhan Bedia
 4. Most Surji devi (Aged about 53 years)
W/o late Nirmal Bedia
 5. Balkishore Bedia (Aged about 26 years)
 6. Sandeep Bedia (Aged about 23 years)
 7. Gurdayal Bedia (Aged about 20 years)
 8. Suraj Bedia (Aged about 19 years)
5 to 8 S/O late Nirmal Bedia
- All residents of Village- Kadru, P.S.- Patratu, P.O- Barkakana,
Dist- Ramgarh.

... ... **Applicants/Appellants**
Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-
Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-
Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.

... ... **Opposite Parties/Respondents**
With

F.A. No. 160 of 2018

Gobardhan Munda (Aged about 39 years)
S/O Late Jeetman Munda
Resident of Village- Kadru, P.S- Patratu, P.O- Naya Nagar,
Barkakana, Dist.- Ramgarh.

... ... **Applicant/Appellant**
Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-
Ramgarh, Dist.- Ramgarh
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-
Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.

... ... **Opposite Parties/Respondents**
With

F.A. No. 161 of 2018

1. Shivcharan Bedia @Shivnarayan Bedia (Aged about 40 years)
 2. Bhinu Bedia (Aged about 38 years)
1 & 2 S/o Late Ramcharan Bedia
- All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S- Patratu, P.O-Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.

... ... **Applicants/Appellants**
Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh
 2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
- **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 163 of 2018

1. Bhukhal @ Bhukhlu Bedia (Aged about 48 years)
 2. Dashrath Bedia (Aged about 43 years)
 3. Motilal Bedia (Aged about 40 years)
 4. Sugriv Bedia (Aged about 37 years)
- All sons of Late. Sohrai Bedia
All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S- Patratu, P.O- Naya Nagar, Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.
- **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh.
 2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
- **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 166 of 2018

1. Ganesh Karmali (Aged about 40 years)
 2. Mahesh Karmali (Aged about 38 years)
 3. Suresh Karmali (Aged about 35 years)
1 to 3 S/o Late Jagu Karmali
 4. Most. Pratima Devi (Aged about 58 years)
W/O Late Naresh Karmali
 5. Khushbu Kumari (Aged about 22 years)
D/O Late Naresh Karmali
 6. Rishi Karmali (Aged about 19 years)
S/O Late Naresh Karmali
All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S-Patratu, P.O- Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.
- **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh.
 2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
- **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 167 of 2018

1. Basudev Bedia (Aged about 26 years)
2. Sukhdev Bedia (Aged about 24 years)
3. Dukhi Bedia (Aged about 21 years)
All Grandsons of Late Bhola Bedia
(S/O Late Sitku Bedia)
All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S- Patratu, P.O- Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.
... .. **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-
Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh.
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-
Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
... .. **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 169 of 2018

1. Badhan Bedia (Aged about 50 years)
2. Jivlal Bedia (Aged about 47 years)
Both S/O Late Kushal Bedia
Resident of Village- Kadru,
P.S- Patratu, P.O- Barkakana, Dist-Ramgarh.
... .. **Applicants/Appellants**

Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-
Ramgarh, Dist- Ramgarh.
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-
Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
... .. **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

With
F.A. No. 170 of 2018

Nandu Karmali (Aged about 38 years)
s/o Late Ramlal Karmali
All residents of Village- Kadru,
P.S- Patratu, P.O- Naya Nagar, Barkakana, Dist.-Ramgarh.
... .. **Applicant/Appellant**

Versus

1. Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh now Ramgarh, PO+PS-
Ramgarh, Dist.- Ramgarh.
2. The Deputy Chief Engineer (Const.) East Central Railway, P.O-
Barkakana, P.S. – Patratu, Dist. Ramgarh.
... .. **Opposite Parties/Respondents**

CORAM :HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANUBHA RAWAT CHOUDHARY

For the Appellants	: Mr. Mitul Kumar, Advocate
For the (Railway)	: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Sr. Panel Counsel
Union of India	: Ms. Bakshi Vibha, Advocate (in all cases)
For the State	: Mr. Vishal Kumar Rai, A.C. to G.A. IV (In F.A. No. 152 of 2018)
For the Resp. No. 2	: Mr. Prabhat Kumar Sinha, Advocate (In F.A. No. 154 of 2018)
For the State	: Mr. Nawal Kishor Pandey, A.C. to S.C. (L&C) I

06/13.10.2025

Learned counsel for the parties are present.

2. All the first appeals being F.A No. 152 of 2018 , F.A No. 154 of 2018, F.A No. 156 of 2018, F.A. No. 160 of 2018, F.A. No. 161 of 2018, F.A. No. 163 of 2018, F.A. No. 166 of 2018, F.A. No. 167 of 2018, F.A. No. 169 of 2018 and F.A. No. 170 of 2018 have been filed against the common Judgment dated 12.12.2017 (Award sealed and signed on 22.12.2017) passed by the learned Sr. Civil Judge-II-cum-Special Judge, L.R. Cases, Ramgarh in L.R. Case Nos. 94/2012, 72/2012, 80/2012, 75/2012, 84/2012, 240/2012, 99/2012, 77/2012, 87/2012 and 88/2012 respectively whereby and whereunder the learned court has awarded less compensation @ Rs.3,000/- per decimal for all classes of land to the appellants. The appellants-claimants have preferred these appeals for enhancement of the compensation @ Rs.8,000/- per decimal for all classes of land.

3. Learned counsel for the parties have also submitted that the appellants are aggrieved by the grant of compensation at less amount @ Rs. 3,000/- for all classes of land to the appellants and the appellants have preferred these appeals for enhancement of compensation @ Rs. 8000/- per decimal for all classes of land. They have jointly submitted that all the appeals arise out of same land acquisition process with respect to the village Kadru and identical issues are involved in all these cases.

4. The learned counsel for the parties has jointly submitted that all these first appeals arise out of Land Reference cases and nomenclature of all the cases decided by the learned court is L.R. Case. They submit that all appeals arise out of Land Acquisition case No. 20 of 2004-05. The First Appeals and the corresponding L.R. Cases are as under: -

Land Reference Case No.	Corresponding First Appeal No.
L.R. Case No. 94 of 2012	F.A. No. 152 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 72 of 2012	F.A. No. 154 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 80 of 2012	F.A. No. 156 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 75 of 2012	F.A. No. 160 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 84 of 2012	F.A. No. 161 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 240 of 2012	F.A. No. 163 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 99 of 2012	F.A. No. 166 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 77 of 2012	F.A. No. 167 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 87 of 2012	F.A. No. 169 of 2018
L.R. Case No. 88 of 2012	F.A. No. 170 of 2018

5. Learned counsel for the appellants submitted that all the first appeals out of acquisition of lands of Village-Kadru and identical issues are involved in all these cases.

6. Learned counsels for the parties have jointly submitted that arising out of the same impugned judgment passed by the learned court and in relation to the same village, namely, Kadru, arising out of the same notification for acquisition of land, this Court has decided other appeals being F.A. No. 176 of 2018 and other analogous cases vide judgment dated 25.03.2025.

7. The learned counsels have jointly submitted that these appeals are squarely covered by the aforesaid judgment passed by this Court and these appeals may also be disposed of in the same terms. The operative portion of the aforesaid judgement passed by this court is quoted as under: -

“41. All these first appeals are hereby allowed with the modification of the award only with respect to the rate of compensation for the acquired land and the impugned judgement is modified as under: -

“Considering the development of all the surrounding areas as well as industries of the area, the compensation rate should be Rs.7000/- per decimal. Accordingly, the appellants shall be entitled to get compensation at the rate of Rs.7000/- per decimal. The appellants shall be

entitled for solatium and other benefit also as admissible under the Act.”

8. After hearing the learned counsels for the parties and with the consent of the parties, the present appeals are also disposed of in terms of the judgment dated 25.03.2025 passed by this Court in F.A. No. 176 of 2018 and other analogous cases.

9. Accordingly, these first appeals are hereby allowed with the modification of the respective awards only with respect to the rate of compensation for the acquired land and the impugned judgement is modified as under: -

“Considering the development of all the surrounding areas as well as industries of the area, the compensation rate should be Rs.7000/- per decimal. Accordingly, the appellants shall be entitled to get compensation at the rate of Rs.7000/- per decimal. The appellants shall be entitled for solatium and other benefit also as admissible under the Act.”

10. At this, the learned counsels for the parties have also submitted that the lead case decided by this court is F.A. No. 176 of 2018 along with other analogous cases which was decided vide order dated 25.03.2025. While deciding the lead case and analogous cases, there was no defect pointed out by the office regarding the nomenclature of the cases decided by the learned civil court (Land Reference case or Land Acquisition case) and same judgement is impugned in present first appeals also. However, out of the batch of cases listed today, in only two cases i.e. F.A. No. 154 of 2018 and F.A. No. 170 of 2018 there has been a defect pointed out by the office regarding nomenclature and the learned civil court has mechanically changed the nomenclature of the all the L.R. Cases decided by the impugned judgement as L.A cases which also includes those cases decided earlier vide F.A. No. 176 of 2018 along with other analogous cases. They jointly submit that the case arise out of Reference case and the correct nomenclature is L.R. Case and not L.A. Case. Accordingly, they submit that it be recorded that in F.A. No. 154 of 2018 and F.A.

No. 170 of 2018, the nomenclature of the case decided by the learned court be taken as L.R. Case and not L.A. Case.

11. In view of the aforesaid submissions, it is directed that the correct nomenclature of the cases decided by the learned trial court in F.A. No. 154 of 2018 and F.A. No. 170 of 2018 would be L.R. Case and not L.A. Case. The learned counsel for the appellants shall carry out necessary correction in the memo of appeals i.e. in F.A. No. 154 of 2018 and in F.A. No. 170 of 2018. While preparing the decree, the office shall take the case number of the impugned judgement as L.R. Case and not L.A. Case.

12. Pending I.A., if any, is closed.

13. Let a copy of this judgment and also the appellate decree be communicated to the court concerned through 'e-mail/FAX'.

(Anubha Rawat Choudhary, J.)

Dated: 13/10/2025

Binit