

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.33166/2025]

SAVITRI DEVI NAGAR & ORS.

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No. 37658/2025]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No. 38027/2025]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.3523/2026]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.3277/2026]

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. We have heard learned Senior Counsel on behalf of the appellants as well as learned Senior Counsel representing the Ghaziabad Development Authority. The

High Court has through the impugned judgment elaborately discussed the broad principles required to be followed in the matter of acquisition of land, previously under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (since repealed) (in short, the "1894 Act") as well as implication of the provisions of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (in short, the "2013 Act"). In this vein, the High Court rightly held that it was not a case of such urgency where Section 17 of the 1894 Act ought to have been invoked.

3. Having identified such illegality in the acquisition process and having considered the 2013 Act, which, meanwhile, came into force, the High Court has rightly held that the appellants are entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act. The High Court, however, has directed that the relevant date for determining the compensation would be 01.01.2014, namely, the date on which the 2013 Act came into force.

4. It seems to us that there has been a spate of litigation across a Pan-India basis concerning the interpretation of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act, in terms whereof, an acquisition made under the 1894 Act was sought to be declared as having lapsed by virtue of a deeming fiction. That provision has been the subject

matter of interpretation before this Court in a catena of decisions. This resulted in complete uncertainty for the Authorities and the owners regarding the legal status of the acquisition process. Eventually, the controversy came to be settled when a Constitution Bench of this Court in Indore Development Authority vs. Manoharlal, (2020) 8 SCC 129, made a fresh construction of Section 24(2) of the 2013 Act.

5. It further seems that in the instant case, the writ petitions were filed in 2005 or so, challenging the acquisition of 2004. These writ petitions also remain pending, owing to the prevailing legal uncertainty and multiple doubts regarding the legality of the old acquisition or its lapsing under 24(2) of the 2013 Act. This uncertainty, having been resolved in 2019, we are of the view that the description of the cut-off date for determining compensation under the 2013 Act warrants a revisit.

6. While such a date need not be brought out of the hat, we are guided by the fact that the Constitution Bench has already settled the controversy in the year 2020 or so. We, therefore, by invoking our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India, hold that the appellants are entitled to the determination of compensation of the acquired land as on 01.01.2020 for the purpose of passing an award in accordance with the

provisions of the 2013 Act.

7. In this view of the matter, paragraph 116(a) of the impugned judgment dated 17.10.2025 of the High Court is modified, and the appellants are, accordingly, held entitled to compensation, the market value whereof shall be determined as on 01.01.2020.

8. All these appeals stand disposed of in the above terms.

9. We also deem it appropriate to further clarify that the cut-off date evolved today, for the purpose of giving benefits under the 2013 Act shall not create a new cause of action for the land owners, whose matters have already been settled at different levels. They shall not be entitled to seek the reopening of the matters, particularly those of the Delhi Acquisition or any other acquisition process where the dates prior to 01.01.2020 have been fixed for the purpose of determining the compensation amount.

10. In view of the above-stated modification in the impugned judgment, which is likely to have some significant financial implications, we extend the time granted by the High Court to enable the Authorities to take a final call within a period of six months from today.

11. If the Authorities decide not to utilise the acquired land within the extended period of six months, the appellant shall be at liberty to seek revival of these proceedings.

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

NEW DELHI;
FEBRUARY 23, 2026

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).33166/2025

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 17-10-2025 in WRITC No.77647/2005 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad]

SAVITRI DEVI NAGAR & ORS.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 293477/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 293479/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

WITH

SLP(C) No. 37658/2025 (XI)

IA No. 332484/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

SLP(C) No. 38027/2025 (XI)

IA No. 333235/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

SLP(C) No. 3523/2026 (XI)

IA No. 25140/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

SLP(C) No. 3277/2026 (XI)

IA No. 22533/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Date : 23-02-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHIFor Petitioner(s) :Mr. Aman Lekhi, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Anushruti, Adv.
Mr. Ravi Tyagi, AOR
Ms. Aanavi Oberai, Adv.
Ms. Snigdha Rajpal, Adv.
Mr. Akash Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Ankit Tyagi, Adv.Mr. Haraprasad Sahu, Adv.
Mr. Shiv Kant Mishra, Adv.
Mr. Shivanand Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Santosh Sahoo, Adv.
Mr. Pranaya Kumar Mohapatra, AOR

Mr. Sanjay Jain, AOR
Mr. Amber Jain, Adv.

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Arijit Prasad, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Praveen Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Gunnam Venkateswara Rao, AOR
Mr. C. Sanal Nambiar, Adv.
Ms. Abhinav Shailly, Adv.
Ms. Chetna Singh, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Mathur, Adv.
Ms. Devyani Mahra, Adv.

Mr. Ajay Kumar Mishra, Adv. Gen.
Mr. Shaurya Sahay, AOR
Mr. Aman Jaiswal, Adv.

Mrs. Anushka Sharda, Adv.
Ms. Raveena Rai, Adv.
Mr. Siddhant Grover, Adv.
M/s Khaitan & Co., AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeals are disposed of in terms of the signed order.
3. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(signed order is placed on the file)

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR