

MFA NO. 100786/2020 (LAC) C/w MFA NO. 100781/2020,
MFA NO. 100782/2020, MFA NO. 100783/2020,
MFA NO. 100784/2020, MFA NO. 100785/2020,
MFA NO. 101554/2020, MFA NO. 101555/2020,
MFA NO. 101556/2020, MFA NO. 101557/2020,
MFA NO. 101558/2020, MFA.CROB NO. 100077/2020,
MFA.CROB NO.100078/2020, MFA.CROB NO. 100079/2020,
MFA.CROB NO. 100080/2020, MFA.CROB NO. 100081/2020,
MFA.CROB NO. 100082/2020, MFA.CROB NO. 100067/2024,
MFA.CROB NO. 100073/2024, MFA.CROB NO. 100074/2024,
MFA.CROB NO. 100075/2024, MFA.CROB NO. 100079/2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT DHARWAD
[ARCELOR MITTAL INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED VS. G HEMA
REDDY S/O G. BASAPPA AND OTHERS]

26.03.2026

(VIDEO CONFERENCING / PHYSICAL HEARING)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD
and
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SHIVASHANKAR
AMARANNAVAR

ORAL ORDER

(PER: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)

Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi and Sri D.L.N. Rao, the learned Senior Counsels for the Beneficiaries, while inviting this Court's attention to the previous order dated 16.03.2026 and relying on a Brief Note filed into this Court on the delay in complying with the Office Objection notwithstanding multiple opportunities granted by this Court, underscore that the Cross-objectors *[i]* have not filed

proper valuation or paid court fee accordingly, **[ii]** have not filed copies of SLAO Award/Reference Application, **[iii]** have not explained why a person who is not a party to the Reference is arrayed as a respondent and **[iv]** in many of the cross-objections, there is no reference to the respective reference [LAC numbers]. The learned Senior Counsels emphasize that the delay of over five years in ensuring compliances will have a huge financial implication if, in the ultimate analysis, the Cross-objectors could succeed, and the learned Senior Counsels are categorical in entering a caveat in stating that the Cross-objectors cannot succeed.

Sri Nandish Patil, the learned counsel for some of the Cross-objectors, submits that this Court could dispense with the production of a certified copy of the SLAO award and the reference applications as it could be a part of the Trial Court Records in the appeals, and the learned Counsel further submits that, as of today, the court fee is paid in consultation with the office in each of these Cross Objections. This Court must frown upon the latter submission. It is responsibility of the Cross-objectors to file the Valuation Slip and pay Court Fee; and even as of today,

the Valuation Slips do not have the details of Valuation or the payment of court fee must necessarily be based on the valuation and the cross-objections must necessarily refer to the LAC number.

This Court could consider dispensing with production of certified copy of the SLAO's Award and common judgment and award, and also the Application for Reference provided Proper Valuation is filed in each of the Cross-objections offering corresponding proper court fee and within the next date of hearing. This Court must also observe that while condoning the delay in compliance and dispensing with production of certified Copies, this Court will examine why there must not be an order denying *interest/solatium payable* for the delayed period even if Cross-objectors would succeed.

The appeals and the cross-objections are adjourned, finally, to be called on **16.04.2026** stipulating that the Cross-objectors in each of the cross-objections shall file separate Valuation Slips and the details of the Court fee offered and amend prayer column in each of the Cross-

Objections. It is needless to observe that, if despite these opportunities which are peremptory in nature, there is failure, the cross-objections will stand rejected.

The Office is directed to file a Tabulation on time taken in each of these Cross-objections to file complete Valuation and offer proper Court Fee in terms thereof.

(B.M.SHYAM PRASAD)
JUDGE

(SHIVASHANKAR AMARANNAVAR)
JUDGE

KMS
List No.: 4 Sl No.: 18