

ITEM NO.102

COURT NO.8

SECTION IX

SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
 CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). 3596-3611 OF 2000

BAI SHAKRIBEN (D) THR.LRS.& ORS

Appellant (s)

VERSUS

SPL. LAQ OFFICER, VADODARA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(With appln(s) for bring on record the subsequent events/directions and office report)

Date: 02/12/2008 These Appeals were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DALVEER BHANDARI
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARJIT SINGH BEDI

For Appellant(s) Mr. Dushyant Dave, Sr. Adv.
 Ms. Meenakshi Arora, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. L.N. Rao, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Manu Nair, Adv.
 Mr. Kirat Singh Nagra, Adv.
 Ms. S.N. Purohit, Adv. for
 M/S Suresh A. Shroff & Co.

Ms. Hemantika Wahi ,Adv
 Ms. Mamta, Adv.

UPON hearing counsel the Court made the following
 ORDER

Mr. Dushyant Dave, learned senior counsel resumed
 his arguments at 11.15 a.m. and concluded at 11.45 a.m..
 Thereafter, Mr. Nageshwar Rao, learned senior counsel
 appearing for respondent No. 1 commenced his arguments.

At this stage, Mr. Dave, learned senior counsel
 submitted that in view of the peculiar facts of this case and the

2

entitlement of benefits under Sections 23(2) and 28 of the
 Land Acquisition Act, 1894, as amended on 24.9.1984 with
 retrospective effect to proceedings pending between 30.4.1982
 to 24.9.1984, and the law declared by this court in catena of
 decisions, including in Raghubir Singh Vs. Union of India
 (1989)2 SCC 754 and considering that the appellants are poor
 farmers who have lost their livelihood, the Corporation may
 consider granting the appropriate statutory benefits in the

interest of justice. Mr. Dave further submitted that the appellants will forgo interest on the above entitlements at market rate or even statutory rate and are agreed to accept interest @ 6% p.a. for future period beginning from 24.9.1984.

Considering the request of Mr. Dave and without going into the merits of this case, we feel that the Corporation, being a statutory body, should consider it in right earnest.

We make it clear that the this order shall not be treated as a precedent. Mr. Nageshwar Rao, learned senior counsel appearing for respondent No. 1 has agreed to place this suggestion before the concerned authority for taking an appropriate decision.

As prayed, list on 13.1.2009.

(Pardeep Kumar)
Court Master

(Neeru Bala Vij)
Court Master