

z1

ITEM NO.101

COURT NO.12

SECTION XII

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Civil Appeal No(s). 3823/2017

SHAKUNTALA CHOUDHRY & ORS.ETC.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

CHAIRMAN AND M.D. T.H.B. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(with appln. (s) for directions and impleadment and directions and permission to place addl. documents on record)

WITH

C.A. No. 3826/2017

(With APPLN. (S) FOR adducing additional documents and Office Report for Direction)

C.A. No. 3824/2017

(With APPLN. (S) FOR urging additional facts and grounds and Office Report for Direction)

Date : 27/04/2017 These appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MISHRA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMITAVA ROY

For Appellant(s) Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Chandra Uday Singh, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Aarohi Bhalla, Adv.

Mr. Aviral D., Adv.

Mrs. Kanchan Kaur Dhodi, Adv.

Dr. A. Francis Julian, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Sondarrajan, Adv.

Mr. Antony R. Julian, Adv.

Mr. Danish Zubair Khan, Adv.

Mr. Ubaid UL Hasan Khan, Adv.

Mr. Sumit Kumar, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, AG

Mr. C Paramasivam, Adv.

Ms. Nithya, Adv.

Mr. Maha Lakshmi, Adv.

Mr. Partha Sarathi, Adv.

Mr. M. Yogesh Kanna, Adv.

Mrs. Geetha Kovilan, Adv.

Mr. P.R. Kovilan, Adv.

2

Mr. M.K. Awasthi, Adv.

Mr. B. Balaji, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.

(NEELAM GULATI)

COURT MASTER

(TAPAN KR. CHAKRABORTY)

COURT MASTER

(Signed order is placed on the file)

1

I N T H E S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL No(s). 3823 OF 2017

SHAKUNTALA CHOUDHRY & ORS.ETC.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

CHAIRMAN AND M.D. T.H.B. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL No(s). 3826 OF 2017

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL No(s). 3824 OF 2017

O R D E R

We agree with the High Court particularly for the reason that the appellants had purchased the

land in the year, 1992, much after the Notification under Section 4 and Declaration Under Section 6 were issued. As such they could not have questioned the acquisition or its lapse in any manner, whatsoever. Consequently, inter alia for this additional reason, no interference is required. On merits also we find no case for interference is made out. Consequently, the appeals are dismissed.

.....J.

(ARUN MISHRA)

.....J.

(AMITAVA ROY)

NEW DELHI;

APRIL 27, 2017