



2026:DHC:7389



\$~23 & 24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% ***Date of Decision: 1st September, 2026***# **CNR No. DLHC010235092023**

+ LA.APP. 303/2023 & CM APPL. 31713/2023

UNION OF INDIAAppellant

Through: Mr. Siddharth Panda, Advocate.

versus

JAWAHAR SINGH (DECEASED) THR. LRS

& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankkit Gupta, Mr. Harsh Jain and Mr. Narendra Deopandey, Advocates for R1.
Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Advocate for DDA.# **CNR No. DLHC010469112023**

+ LA.APP. 618/2023 & CM APPL. 60322/2023

UNION OF INDIAAppellant

Through: Mr. Siddharth Panda, Advocate.

versus

SH. JITENDER MANN DEC. THR. LRS.

& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Ankkit Gupta, Mr. Harsh Jain and Mr. Narendra Deopandey, Advocates for R1.
Mr. Neeraj Kumar, Advocate for DDA.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN****AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)**

1. LA.APP. 303/2023 is filed by the appellant seeking setting aside the judgment and order dated 16.07.2022, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Rohini Courts, Delhi ('ADJ') in LAC No.



81/2018 in respect of the award No. 08/2003-04 pertaining to revenue estate of Village Bakoli, Delhi, pursuant to which, the learned ADJ while considering the reference under Section 18 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894, ('Act'), enhanced the compensation for acquisition of the respondents' land from Rs. 15,70,000/- per acre to Rs. 16,74,500/- per acre (Category A Land).

2. LA.APP. 618/2023 is filed by the appellant seeking setting aside the judgment and order dated 28.08.2023, passed by learned ADJ in LAC No. 55/2020 in respect of the award No. 08/2003-04 pertaining to revenue estate of Village Bakoli, Delhi, pursuant to which, the learned ADJ while considering the reference under Section 18 of Land Acquisition Act, 1894, ('Act'), enhanced the compensation for acquisition of the respondents' land from Rs. 15,70,000/- per acre to Rs. 16,74,500/- per acre (Category A Land).

3. The learned ADJ while passing the impugned order relied upon the judgment passed in ***Desh Raj Gupta v. Union of India through Land Acquisition Collector, North West Delhi & Anr.*** in LAC No. 213A/2011 decided on 03.09.2012, in regard to the compensation being granted to the land owners in the same village.

4. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that the learned Trial Court while deciding the case ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*) had, in turn, relied on the judgment passed in the case of ***Jai Singh v. Union of India*** in LA Appeal No. 266/2008. He submits that the land in the ***Jai Singh's*** (*supra*) case was situated in a different village and the reliance was wrongly placed by the learned Trial Court while deciding the ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*) case.



5. It remains undisputed that the Union of India at no stage had challenged the judgment passed in ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*).
6. I have also perused the judgment passed by the learned Trial Court in ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*). The reasons which led to the learned Trial Court passing the judgment in the said case are as under:

*“8. As far as the market rate of the land is concerned, it is important to mention that Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the market value determined by Hon’ble High Court in the case titled as “Jai Singh Vs. UOI” in LA Appeal No. 266/08 wherein land of the adjoining villages namely Holambi Kalan, Holambi Khurd, Alipur and Razapur Kalan were acquired by the same notification dated 22.08.2001. That land was also acquired for construction of 100 feet wide road in Narela Freight Complex as has been done in this case. Hon’ble Delhi High Court in that appeal has fixed the rate of the land of the aforesaid villages @ Rs.16,74,500/- per acre for the land falling in category A and @ Rs. 16,43,811/- per acre for the land falling in the category B. In the same judgment wherein the price of 4 villages has been fixed at this rate which was acquired vide same notification. Hon’ble High Court has held that all these villages fall in the same location i.e. the area between National Highway No.10 known as Rohtak Road and National Highway No. 1 known as GT Karnal Road. It was also held that the urbanized city of Delhi where the colony Rohini exist is situated within the aforesaid two National Highways and on the basis of parity, the market value of these 4 villages acquired vide notification dated 22.08.2001 was assessed @ Rs.16,74,500/- per acre for category A and Rs. 16,43,811/- for category B. **Though Ld. Counsel for the respondent has argued that there is no material on record to hold that the land of village Bakoli is similarly situated as that of villages like Holambi Kalan, Alipur etc., but I do not find any force in his contention since the map of North West Delhi reveals that the village Bakoli is similarly situated as that of the aforesaid 4 villages land of which was acquired vide same notification.** I do not find any reason or facts before me to have a different valuation than that of the villages Alipur etc. as assessed by Hon’ble High Court in the case titled as “Jai Singh Vs. UOI”. **The petitioner before me is also entitled to same rate for this land i.e. Rs. 16,74,500/- per acre for category A and @ Rs. 16.43.811/- per acre for category B.**”*

7. In the opinion of this Court, the learned Trial Court while



2026:DHC:7389



deciding the ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*) had considered the arguments advanced by the Union of India in regard to the distinction in the villages in the cases and had rightly negated the same by opining that the villages are similarly located. Even otherwise, in the opinion of this Court, the enhancement is not too high which could merit consideration in the present appeals, specially when similarly situated land owners have already been given the benefit in ***Desh Raj Gupta*** (*supra*) case.

8. The appeals are therefore dismissed.
9. A copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2026

DV