

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2924-2925 OF 2020)

AMIT BAKSHI & ANR.

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH

RESPONDENT(S)

W I T H

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 28772-28777 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . _____ OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 19348 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 24301 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 25793 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 24299 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 6585-6611 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 8015-8018 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 8013-8014 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 6612-6614 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 29489-29658 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . _____ OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 28771 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 6615-6616 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 6617 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 36442 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 12464 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 41864 OF 2019)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2202-2211 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2404-2406 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2407-2412 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2401-2402 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2926 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 2927-2929 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 5359 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 10451 OF 2020)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 7270-7271 OF 2022)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 12033 OF 2022)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . OF 2025)
(DIARY NO(S) . 27412 OF 2022)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 21678 OF 2022)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 27612-27613 OF 2025)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 15731-15733 OF 2024)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 29042-29043 OF 2025)

CIVIL APPEAL NO(S) . OF 2025
(ARISING OUT OF SLP (CIVIL) NO(S) . 24068-24069 OF 2025)

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. Applications for substitution are allowed after condoning the delay and setting aside abatement, if any.
3. Leave granted.
4. The present appeals have been filed both by the claimants and the acquiring body, namely, the Union Territory of Chandigarh. We are concerned with the two awards passed by the Reference Court, in pursuance of the Notification dated 01.10.2002 under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. An award was passed on 29.03.2004 in

Award No. 569 by the Land Acquisition Officer (for short, 'the LAO'), who classified the lands under acquisition into three categories and awarded compensation on acre basis @ Rs.7,35,056/- for low lying uncultivated land, Rs.8,46,064/- for low lying cultivated land and Rs.10,50,080/- for normal levelled land by considering the nature of the land *qua* their cultivation. The Reference Court enhanced the amount and awarded a uniform sum of Rs.12,60,096/- in the first award dated 21.09.2011 and thereafter for similarly placed lands, enhanced the amount to Rs.24,14,555/- in the second set of awards.

5. We may note that the Reference Court did not agree with the classification made by the Land Acquisition Officer while fixing the amount of compensation though it had passed two different awards.

6. Insofar as the other Notification dated 20.02.2003 is concerned, an award was passed by the LAO on 23.03.2004 in Award No. 567. In this case, the LAO fixed the compensation for all lands at a flat rate @ Rs.10,50,080/- same as the amount fixed for the third category of lands, which is the subject matter of Award No.569. Thereafter, a sum of Rs.22,66,700/- came to be awarded by the Reference Court, which is strangely much lesser than the sum awarded in the second Award by the Reference Court, which was for a sum of Rs.24,14,555/- pertaining to notification dated 01.10.2002. The High Court computed the potential value of the land in the following manner:

"33. Thus, the argument, as such, of the counsel for U.T. Administration that on account of the restrictions

on land use, there was no potential, as such, is misplaced and cannot be accepted. Rather, the location of the land would go on to show that the land had immense potential and the principles laid down in General Manager, Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd. Vs. Rameshbhai Jivanbhai Patel & another (2008) 14 SCC 745 would be directly applicable. In the present facts and circumstances, for urban areas and pockets in big cities, on account of rapid development and high demand of land, has resulted in escalation in market value from 10% to 15% per year. Relevant portions of the judgment read as under:

"11. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondents/claimants submitted that the rate of escalation in market value at the relevant time was in the range of 10% to 15 % per annum. He relied on the decisions of this Court in Ranjit Singh v. Union Territory of Chandigarh [1992 (4) SCC 659], and Land Acquisition Officer and Revenue Divisional Officer v. Ramanjulu & Ors. 2005 (9) SCC 594 wherein this Court had accepted an escalation of ten per cent per annum, and the decision in Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti Sahaswom v. Bipin Kumar 2004 (2) SCC 283 where this Court had accepted an escalation of 15% per annum. He, therefore, submitted that escalation at the rate of 10 per cent adopted by the Reference Court and approved by the High Court is a reasonable and correct standard to be applied.

12. We have examined the facts of the three decisions relied on by the respondents. They all related to acquisitions of lands in urban or semi-urban areas. Ranjit Singh related to acquisition for development of Sector 41 of Chandigarh. Ramanjulu related to acquisition of the third phase of an existing and established industrial estate in an urban area. Bipin Kumar related to an acquisition of lands adjoining Badaun-Delhi Highway in an semi-urban area where building construction activity was going on all around the acquired lands.

13. Primarily, the increase in land prices depends on four factors -situation of the land, nature of development in surrounding area, availability of land for development in the area, and the demand for land in the area. In rural areas unless there is any prospect of development in the vicinity, increase in prices would be slow, steady and gradual, without any sudden spurts or jumps. On the other hand, in urban or semi-urban areas, where the development is faster, where the demand for land is high and where there is construction activity all around, the escalation in market price is at a much higher rate, as compared to rural areas. In some pockets in big cities, due to rapid development and high demand for land, the escalations in prices have touched even 30% to 50% or more per year, during the nineties.

14. On the other extreme, in remote rural areas where there was no chance of any development and hardly any buyers, the prices stagnated for years or rose marginally at a nominal rate of 1% or 2% per annum. There is thus a significant difference in increases in market value of lands in urban/semi-urban areas and increases in market value of lands in the rural areas. Therefore if the increase in market value in urban/semi-urban areas is about 10% to 15% per annum, the corresponding increases in rural areas would at best be only around half of it, that is about 5% to 7.5% per annum. This rule of thumb refers to the general trend in the nineties, to be adopted in the absence of clear and specific evidence relating to increase in prices. Where there are special reasons for applying a higher rate of increase, or any specific evidence relating to the actual increase in prices, then the increase to be applied would depend upon the same."

34. Rather, the principles laid down in *Udho Dass Vs. State of Haryana & others* (2010) 12 SCC 51 would be directly applicable to the facts and circumstances of

the present case. The acquisition, as noticed, is between the period from 2002 to 2008 and the landowners still are seeking the adequate compensation which has now been received in instalments. In Udho Dass (supra), it was noticed that increase could be of 100% per year for the land which has the potential of being urbanized. Relevant portions of the judgment read as under:

"17. The land was notified for acquisition in May 1990. The collector rendered his award in May 1993 awarding a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- per acre. The Reference Court by its award dated January 2001 increased the compensation to Rs.125 per square yard for the land of the road behind the ECE factory and Rs.150 per square yard for the land abutting the road which would come to Rs.6,05,000/- and Rs.7,26,000/- respectively for the two pieces of land. This itself is a huge increase vis-a-vis the Collector's award. The High Court in First Appeal by its judgment of 24th September 2007 enhanced the compensation for the two categories to Rs.135 and 160 respectively making it Rs.6,53,400/- and Rs.7,74,400/. In other words, this is the compensation which ought to have been awarded by the Collector at the time of his award on 12th May 1993. This has, however, come to the land owner for the first time as a result of the judgment of the High Court which is under challenge in this appeal; in other words, a full 17 years from the date of Notification under Section 4 and 14 years from the date of the award of the Collector on which date the possession of the land must have been taken from the landowner.

18. Concededly, the Act also provides for the payment of the solatium, interest and an additional amount but we are of the opinion, and it is common knowledge, that even these payments do not keep pace with the astronomical rise in prices in many parts of India, and most certainly in North India, in the land price and cannot fully compensate for the acquisition of the land and the payment of the compensation in dribblets. The

12% per annum increase which Courts have often found to be adequate in compensation matters hardly does justice to those land owners whose land have been acquired as judicial notice can be taken of the fact that the increase is not 10 or 12 or 15% per year but is often upto 100% a year for land which has the potential of being urbanized and commercialized such as in the present case. Be that as it may, we must assume that the landowners were entitled to the compensation fixed by the High Court on the date of the award of the Collector and had this amount been made available to the landowners on that date, it would have been possible for them to rehabilitate their holdings in some other place. This exercise has been defeated for the simple reason that the payment of compensation has been spread over almost two decades."

35. In the present set of cases, the amounts awarded by the Land Acquisition Collector, as reproduced in para No.I of the judgment, would go on to show that there was steep rise in prices between the year 2002 to 2008 for Chandigarh, which was acknowledged and granted by the Land Acquisition Collector as from Rs.10,50,080/- assessed in October, 2002, a sum of Rs.39,40,326/- had been assessed in August, 2007.

36. Apart from this, another chart, reproduced below, would depict how the land was being put to use by the State and examples at Sr. Nos.2 & 3 were part of the acquired land for the first award itself, which would go on to show the potentiality of development of the land which was acquired:

Sr. No.	Date of allotment/ auction/lease Exhibit	Amount of land in acres	Consideration in Rs.	Rate in Rs.
1	23.12.2003 (Ext.P-28)	12.5	To M/s DLF for 11.2 crores + premium of 22.62 crores	2.71 crores/ acre
2	17.05.2006 (Ext.PW-10/A)	4.9	To M/s Kujjal Builders for 15 crores	3.06 crores/ acre

3	09.06.2006 (Ext.PW-11/C)	135	To M/s Parsavnath Developers in auction at Rs.821,21,21,210/-	3.1 crores/ acre
4	06.12.2005 (Ext.PD)	5.394	To M/s UPPAL Housing Pvt. Ltd. in auction at Rs.108,01,00,000/-	20.29 crores/ acre

37. Similarly, the chart, reproduced below, would depict the potentiality of development as the land was allotted to IT Companies at the following rates after the 3rd notification dated 02.06.2004 had been issued but before the issuance of the 4th notification dated 03.08.2007:

Sr. No.	Date of allotment/ Exhibit	Amount of land in acres	Sale consideration in Rs.	Rate in Rs.
1	28.12.2005 (Ext.PB/2)	1.306175	To M/s Virsa Systems Pvt. Ltd. for 1,30,61,779/-	1 crore/ acre
2	29.12.2005 (Ext.PB/3)	1.105999	To M/s KMG Infotech Pvt. Ltd. at 1,10,60,015/-	1 crore/ acre
3	02.01.2005 (Ext.PB/4)	1.305514	To M/s Alchemist Ltd. at 1,30,55168/-	1 crore/ acre
4	29.12.2005 (Ext.PB/5)	1.659227	To M/s FCS Software Solutions Ltd. for 1,65,92,311/-	1 crore/ acre
5	15.12.2005 (Ext.PB/6)	1.47	To M/s Second Foundation Inc. for 1,47,00,000	1 crore/ acre
6	02.01.2005 (Ext.PB/7)	1.3213898	To M/s IDS Info Tech Ltd. for 1,32,13,926/-	1 crore/ acre
7	12.06.2006 (Ext.PB/8)	1.50	To M/s R.T. Outsourcing Services Ltd. for 1,50,02,739/-	1 crore/ acre
8	01.06.2006 (Ext.PB/9)	1.50	To M/s Karin Informatics Services Pvt. Ltd. for 1,50,03,110	1 crore/ acre

9	05.06.2006 (Ext.PB/10)	1.50	To M/s Net Solutions for 1,50,61,477/-	1 crore/acre
10	26.05.2006 (Ext.PB/11)	10	To M/s Tech Mahindra Ltd. for 4 crores	40 lakhs/acre
11	25.11.2005 (Ext.PB/12)	1	To M/s BEBO Technologies Pvt. Ltd. for 1 crore	1 crore/acre

xx

xx

xx

45. However, for award No.567, which pertain to the second notification dated 20.02.2003 and similarly, for the third notification dated 02.06.2004, for award No.575, a perusal of the site-plan would go on to show that the lands of the said awards are situated closer to the land acquired for the alternate route No.3 and for the said award, the benefit of enhancement would have to be correspondingly given whereby the amount was quantified as Rs.27,00,340/- per acre on 14.02.2001 in RFA-5519-2009. Resultantly, @ 15%, the market value would work out to Rs.35,71,200/-, for the notification dated 20.02.2003. The relevant table reads as under:

YEAR WISE TABLE IN RESPECT OF ENHANCEMENT @ 15% @ RS. 27,00,340/- FROM 14.2.2001 TO 20.2.2003

Year	Principal amount (Rs.)	Enhanced Amount (Rs.)	Total amount (Rs.)
14.2.2001	27,00,340.00	--	27,00,340.00
14.2.2002	27,00,340.00	4,05,051.00	31,05,391.00
20.2.2003	31,05,391.00	4,65,809.00	35,71,200.00

7. However, the High Court has further classified the lands into two categories and awarded Rs.26,02,807/- for the lands pertaining to the Notification dated 01.10.2002 and Rs.35,71,200/- for the lands pertaining to the Notification dated 20.02.2003 respectively. This

was done notwithstanding the fact that neither the beneficiary nor the acquiring authority chose to question the award(s) passed by the Reference Court, which also includes the computation of uniform market value for all the lands acquired without classifying them into different categories, though the same was done in two different awards. However, it is to be kept in mind that all the lands acquired were pertaining to the same survey number.

8. In our considered view, the award passed by the High Court has to be modified in favour of the claimants for the afore-stated reasons. The High Court, having assessed the potential value of the lands and applying it uniformly to all the lands, ought not to have indulged in further classification, as we are not primarily concerned with the potential value of the agricultural land as the lands have been acquired with respect to their potentiality for development. Suffice it is to state that the procedure adopted by the Reference Court by treating all the lands alike in a single Award passed by it has not been put into challenge by the respondent(s). In the absence of any perversity, we are not inclined to find fault with the approach of the Reference Court. We have also perused the sketch provided by the learned Senior counsel appearing for the appellants. There is absolutely no difference between the lands in Award No.567 and the lands in Award No.569. In fact, the acquired land in Award No.567 is actually related to the lands, which is the subject matter

of Award No.569. Perhaps that is the reason why the Land Acquisition Officer himself has treated the land in Award No.567 by fixing the same valuation as the third category of lands in Award No.569. Thus, looking at it from all perspectives, the land owners in Award No.569 are entitled to the same amount as awarded by the High Court for the land owners in Award No.567. Accordingly, they are entitled to a sum of Rs.35,71,200/- instead of Rs.26,02,807/- along with the statutory benefits as awarded to the land owners in Award No.567 dated 23.03.2004.

9. The submission made by the learned Senior counsel appearing for the beneficiary also cannot be countenanced. In our considered view, the High Court has rightly considered the potential value of the land, which is not in dispute. This is the factual adjudication made by taking into consideration all the evidence available on record, both oral and documentary evidence. The other submission that the lands will have to be viewed differently also cannot be accepted for the reasons stated above as we are concerned only with the potentiality of the land, which is not from the point of view of agricultural potentiality but for the development of land, as such.

10. In such view of the matter, we are inclined to allow the appeals filed by the claimants, who are the land owners in Award No.569 dated 29.03.2004 by enhancing the valuation, as awarded by the High Court from Rs.26,02,807/- to Rs.35,71,200/-. The enhanced amount will have

to be paid by the respondent - Union Territory of Chandigarh within a period of six months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. We make it clear that this order will apply to all other lands, which are subject matter of the appeals. We are also inclined to hold that the claimants will not be entitled to any interest for the period of delay in filing the appeals, except in those cases, where the review petitions were filed. For computing the period of delay, the period spent on filing the review petitions till the date of its disposal will have to be excluded. Ordered accordingly.

11. In view of the above order, the appeals arising out of SLP (Civil) Nos. 29489-29658 of 2019 filed by the Union Territory of Chandigarh are dismissed.

.....J.
(M.M. SUNDRESH)

.....J.
(SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA)

NEW DELHI;
NOVEMBER 06, 2025.

ITEM NO.19

COURT NO.6

SECTION IV-B

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 2924-2925/2020

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 11-02-2019 in RFA No. 1807/2012 and order dated 27-08-2019 in RARF No. 61/2019 in RFA No. 1807/2012 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

AMIT BAKSHI & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 205045/2024 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION and IA No. 11293/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 28772-28777/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 148947/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES and IA No. 136434/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Diary No(s). 19348/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 78282/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 24301/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 69656/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 148449/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ ANNEXURES and IA No. 69658/2024 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 25793/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 151087/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 151088/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. and IA No. 151090/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 24299/2019 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6585-6611/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 107127/2024 - APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT, IA No. 44892/2022 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 44883/2022 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 134649/2020 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 107124/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 45044/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 107134/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 107132/2024 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 8015-8018/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 8013-8014/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 45042/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION)

SLP(C) No. 6612-6614/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 45045/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION)

SLP(C) No. 29489-29658/2019 (IV-B)
(FOR MODIFICATION ON IA 300968/2024)

SLP(C) No. 28771/2019 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6615-6616/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6617/2020 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 36442/2019 (IV-B)
(IA No. 105587/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 105589/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILEING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 12464/2020 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 41864/2019 (IV-B)
(IA No. 258614/2023 - APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT, IA No. 258612/2023 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No. 260963/2023 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2202-2211/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 3465/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2404-2406/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 108492/2022 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS /ANNEXURES)

SLP(C) No. 2407-2412/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 2401-2402/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 2926/2020 (IV-B)

(IA No. 12504/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2927-2929/2020 (IV-B)

(IA No. 13729/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 5359/2020 (IV-B)

(IA No. 27877/2020 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 27878/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 10451/2020 (IV-B)

(IA No. 53907/2020 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 53908/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 7270-7271/2022 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 12033/2022 (IV-B)

(IA No. 85727/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

Diary No(s). 27412/2022 (IV-B)

(IA No. 171204/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 171205/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 21678/2022 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 27612-27613/2025 (IV-D)

(IA No. 87239/2024 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 15731-15733/2024 (IV-D)

SLP(C) No. 29042-29043/2025 (IV-D)

(IA No. 184395/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 24068-24069/2025 (IV-D)

Date : 06-11-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rahul Rathore, Adv.
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.
Mr. Shiv Bhatnagar, Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Nandal, Adv.
Ms. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.

Mr. Shish Pal Laler, Adv.
Mr. Hitesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Atul, Adv.
Mr. Hardik Giri, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Singh Gautam, Adv.
Ms. Preeti Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Ravi Panwar, AOR
Mr. Urfee Haider, Adv.

Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Adv.
Mr. Davinder Kumar Lubana, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka, Adv.
Mr. Ashwani Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. D K Lubana, Adv.
Mr. Sumit Anchal, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Tomar, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini, Adv.

Mr. Ajay Kalra, Adv.
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Isha Janjua, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka, Adv.
Mr. Onkar Nath Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Arjun Raghuvanshi, Adv.
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR

Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR

Mr. Satyarth Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ram Kishor Singh Yadav, AOR

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Suriti Chowdhary, Adv.
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Pritam Raman Giriya, Adv.
Mr. Punit Manoj Agarwal, Adv.

Ms. Pragya Samal, Adv.
Ms. Arushi, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Yadav, Adv.

Mrs. Tanuj Bagga Sharma, AOR
Dr. M.K. Ravi, Adv.
Dr. Praveen Hans, Adv.
Mr. Denson Joseph, Adv.
Ms. Shreya Denson, Adv.

Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Mr. N. S. Boparai, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Surya Pratap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Amarjeet Singh, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Natasha Dalmia, AOR
Ms. Anisha Jain, Adv.
Ms. Shambhavi Singh, Adv.
Ms. Deveshi Chand, Adv.

Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Ravi Panwar, AOR
Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR
Mr. Ram Kishor Singh Yadav, AOR
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mrs. Tanuj Bagga Sharma, AOR
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR
Mr. Amarjeet Singh, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Ms. Natasha Dalmia, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Shubham Bhalla, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. K.M. Nataraj, A.S.G.
Mr. Varun Chugh, Adv.
Mr. Bhuvan Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Kanu Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kant Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Santosh Ramdurg, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rahul Rathore, Adv.
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Shiv Bhatnagar, Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Nandal, Adv.
Ms. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR

Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv.
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Onkar Nath Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Suriti Chowdhary, Adv.
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Pritam Raman Giriya, Adv.
Mr. Punit Manoj Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Pragya Samal, Adv.
Ms. Arushi, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Gagan Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ananta Prasad Mishra, AOR
Mr. Saurabh Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Jasbir Singh, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Sharma, AOR
Mrs. Aditi Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Singh, Adv.
Mr. Digvijay Singh Raghav, Adv.
Ms. Kamlesh, Adv.

Mr. Shubham Bhalla, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Ananta Prasad Mishra, AOR
Mr. Himanshu Sharma, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. Applications for substitution are allowed after condoning the delay and setting aside abatement, if any.
3. Application for amendment in the cause title is allowed.
4. Leave granted.
5. The appeals arising out of SLP (Civil) Nos. 29489-29658 of 2019 are dismissed and rest of the appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.
6. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 2924-2925/2020

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 11-02-2019 in RFA No. 1807/2012 and order dated 27-08-2019 in RARF No. 61/2019 in RFA No. 1807/2012 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

AMIT BAKSHI & ANR.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

UNION TERRITORY OF CHANDIGARH

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 205045/2024 - CLARIFICATION/DIRECTION and IA No. 11293/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 28772-28777/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 148947/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES and IA No. 136434/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES)

Diary No(s). 19348/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 78282/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 24301/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 69656/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 148449/2019 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ ANNEXURES and IA No. 69658/2024 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 25793/2019 (IV-B)

(IA No. 151087/2019 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 151088/2019 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING SUBSTITUTION APPLN. and IA No. 151090/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

SLP(C) No. 24299/2019 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6585-6611/2020 (IV-B)

(IA No. 107127/2024 - APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT, IA No. 44892/2022 -

APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 44883/2022 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 134649/2020 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 107124/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 45044/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION, IA No. 107134/2024 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No. 107132/2024 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 8015-8018/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 8013-8014/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 45042/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION)

SLP(C) No. 6612-6614/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 45045/2024 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION)

SLP(C) No. 29489-29658/2019 (IV-B)
(FOR MODIFICATION ON IA 300968/2024)

SLP(C) No. 28771/2019 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6615-6616/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 6617/2020 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 36442/2019 (IV-B)
(IA No. 105587/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 105589/2021 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILEING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 12464/2020 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 41864/2019 (IV-B)
(IA No. 258614/2023 - APPLICATION FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING THE APPLICATION FOR SETTING ASIDE THE ABATEMENT, IA No. 258612/2023 - APPLICATION FOR SUBSTITUTION and IA No. 260963/2023 - SETTING ASIDE AN ABATEMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2202-2211/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 3465/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2404-2406/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 108492/2022 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS /ANNEXURES)

SLP(C) No. 2407-2412/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 2401-2402/2020 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 2926/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 12504/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 2927-2929/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 13729/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 5359/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 27877/2020 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 27878/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

Diary No(s). 10451/2020 (IV-B)
(IA No. 53907/2020 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 53908/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT)

SLP(C) No. 7270-7271/2022 (IV-B)

Diary No(s). 12033/2022 (IV-B)
(IA No. 85727/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

Diary No(s). 27412/2022 (IV-B)
(IA No. 171204/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING and IA No. 171205/2022 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN REFILING / CURING THE DEFECTS)

SLP(C) No. 21678/2022 (IV-B)

SLP(C) No. 27612-27613/2025 (IV-D)
(IA No. 87239/2024 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 15731-15733/2024 (IV-D)

SLP(C) No. 29042-29043/2025 (IV-D)
(IA No. 184395/2025 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

SLP(C) No. 24068-24069/2025 (IV-D)

Date : 06-11-2025 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rahul Rathore, Adv.
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR

Mr. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.
Mr. Shiv Bhatnagar, Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Nandal, Adv.
Ms. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.

Mr. Shish Pal Laler, Adv.
Mr. Hitesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Atul, Adv.
Mr. Hardik Giri, Adv.
Mr. Pranav Singh Gautam, Adv.
Ms. Preeti Kumari, Adv.
Mr. Ravi Panwar, AOR
Mr. Urfee Haider, Adv.

Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Adv.
Mr. Davinder Kumar Lubana, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka, Adv.
Mr. Ashwani Kumar Sharma, Adv.
Mr. D K Lubana, Adv.
Mr. Sumit Anchal, Adv.
Mr. Ayush Tomar, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Kumar Saini, Adv.

Mr. Ajay Kalra, Adv.
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv.
Ms. Isha Janjua, Adv.
Ms. Priyanka, Adv.
Mr. Onkar Nath Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Arjun Raghuvanshi, Adv.
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR

Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR

Mr. Satyarth Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ram Kishor Singh Yadav, AOR

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Suriti Chowdhary, Adv.
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Pritam Raman Giriya, Adv.
Mr. Punit Manoj Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Pragya Samal, Adv.
Ms. Arushi, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Yadav, Adv.

Mrs. Tanuj Bagga Sharma, AOR
Dr. M.K. Ravi, Adv.
Dr. Praveen Hans, Adv.
Mr. Denson Joseph, Adv.
Ms. Shreya Denson, Adv.

Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Mr. N. S. Boparai, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Surya Pratap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Amarjeet Singh, AOR

Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Natasha Dalmia, AOR
Ms. Anisha Jain, Adv.
Ms. Shambhavi Singh, Adv.
Ms. Deveshi Chand, Adv.

Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Ravi Panwar, AOR
Mr. Yadav Narender Singh, AOR
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR
Mr. Ram Kishor Singh Yadav, AOR
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mrs. Tanuj Bagga Sharma, AOR
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR
Mr. Amarjeet Singh, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Ms. Natasha Dalmia, AOR

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Shubham Bhalla, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR

Mr. K.M. Nataraj, A.S.G.
Mr. Varun Chugh, Adv.
Mr. Bhuvan Kapoor, Adv.
Mr. Kanu Agrawal, Adv.
Mr. Krishna Kant Dubey, Adv.
Mr. Santosh Ramdurg, Adv.
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR

Mr. Narender Hooda, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Rahul Rathore, Adv.
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR

Mr. Shiv Bhatnagar, Adv.
Mr. Yuvraj Nandal, Adv.
Ms. Pallvi Hooda, Adv.

Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR

Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Mr. Nandlal Kumar Mishra, Adv.
Dr. Ajay Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Onkar Nath Sharma, Adv.

Mr. Senthil Jagadeesan, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Suriti Chowdhary, Adv.
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Pritam Raman Giriya, Adv.
Mr. Punit Manoj Agarwal, Adv.
Ms. Pragya Samal, Adv.
Ms. Arushi, Adv.
Mr. Mohit Yadav, Adv.

Mr. Gagan Gupta, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ananta Prasad Mishra, AOR
Mr. Saurabh Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Jasbir Singh, Adv.

Mr. Himanshu Sharma, AOR
Mrs. Aditi Sharma, Adv.
Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Sandeep Singh, Adv.
Mr. Digvijay Singh Raghav, Adv.
Ms. Kamlesh, Adv.

Mr. Shubham Bhalla, AOR
Mr. Gurmeet Singh Makker, AOR
Mr. Shreekant Neelappa Terdal, AOR
Ms. Priyanjali Singh, AOR
Mr. Ravindra Bana, AOR
Mr. Kaushal Yadav, AOR
Ms. Abiha Zaidi, AOR
Mr. Ananta Prasad Mishra, AOR
Mr. Himanshu Sharma, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.
2. Applications for substitution are allowed after condoning the delay and setting aside abatement, if any.
3. Leave granted.
4. The appeals arising out of SLP (Civil) Nos. 29489-29658 of 2019 are dismissed and rest of the appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.
5. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(POONAM VAID)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(Signed order is placed on the file)