2			

57

\$?.

\$7.

끐

HIGH COURT OF DELHI : NEW DELHI (Establishment-II Branch)

~ ~

No. 5428/SLP/DHC/2018

Dated : 07.03.2018

As directed, a copy of order dated 22.02.2018 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India passed in Special Leave to Appeal © No. 5552/2018 (arising out of CC No. 8453/2017) titled "State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. M/s G. D. Goenka Tourism Corporation Limited and Anr" is circulated for information of Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice and Hon'ble Judges.

Sd/-(DINESH KUMAR SHARMA) REGISTRAR GENERAL,

2

\$?

3)

÷,

S,

갌

57

\$?-

5.

5

3

 \geq

- 1. HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE.
 - 2. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT
 - 3. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA
 - 4. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G. S. SISTANI
 - 5. HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE S. MURALIDHAR
 - 6. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI
 - 7. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI
 - 8. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SIDDHARTH MRIDUL
- $\sqrt{9}$ 9. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN
 - ÌQ. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW
- 11. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.R. MIDHA
- 12. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER
- 13. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR
- 14. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VALMIKI J. MEHTA
- 15. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR
- 16. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. PATHAK
- 17. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA
 - 18. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI
- 19. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.P. GARG

20. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAYANT NATH

- 21. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI
- 22. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA
 - 23. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIBHU BAKHRU 24. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V. KAMESWAR RAO
 - 25. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE DEEPA SHARMA
 - 26. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARKASH SINGH TEJI
 - 27. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE I.S. MEHTA
 - 28. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE, R.K. GAUBA
 - 29. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANGITA DHINGRA SEHGAL
 - 30. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. CHAWLA

31. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD GOEL
32. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDER SHEKHAR
33. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA
34. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGESH KHANNA
35. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI
36. HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATHIBA M. SINGH
37. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
38. HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C. HARI SHANKAR

2

×1 ×1

COPY FORWARDED FOR INFORMATION AND NECESSARY ACTION TO:-

1. JOINT DIRECTOR (IT) with request to upload the same on the internet site and websik of this Court.

.

1. 1

1 1

1 14

مير. مدير

传港。

答譽

法法

· *

Ravindra Maithani Secretary General Supreme Court of India

5

5.

 \dot{s}_{i}^{2}

옰

 \dot{z}_{i}^{2}

2.

影

괈

÷.)

37

\$.

2)

Ę.

5

 Ξ_{i}



Tel.: 23384661 Fax: 23386178 E-mail: sg.rmaithani@sci.nic.in

February 22, 2018

Dear Shri Sharma,

Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 5552 of 2018 (arising out of CC No. 8453/2017) titled "State of Haryana and Ors. Vs. M/s G.D. Goenka Tourism Corporation Limited and Anr." was listed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 21.2.2018 when the Hon'ble Court has been pleased to pass, inter alia, the following order:

"Taking all this into consideration, we are of the opinion that it would be appropriate if in the interim and pending a final decision on making a reference (if at all) to a larger Bench, the High Courts be requested not to deal with any cases relating to the interpretation of or concerning Section 24 of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. The Secretary General will urgently communicate this order to the Registrar General of every High Court so that our request is complied with."

A copy of the complete order is enclosed for your reference and further necessary action.

Ĩ.

With regards,

Yours sincerely,

(Ravindra Maithani)

Shri Dinesh Kumar Sharma, Registrar General High Court of Delhi, <u>NEW DELHI – 110 003</u>.

Si.

·· ·		1				
	ITEM NO.8+9+16	COURT NO.4	SECTION IV-B			
	SUI	PREME COURT OF IND RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS	IA			
s) ≥r	Petition(s) for	Special Leave to Appeal (C)	.CC 8453/2017			
ي. بن		ugned final judgment and order d 16 passed by the High Court of H				
	STATE OF HARYANA AN	D ORS.	Petitioner(s)			
م } مرادر م		VERSUS				
	M/S G.D. GOENKA TOU	RISM CORPORATION LIMITED AND ANR	Respondent(s)			
	• • • • • •	CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILIN OF DELAY IN REFILING ON IA 2/20:				
: ;; ;;		(ÍV-B) CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING OF DELAY IN REFILING ON IA 86889				
	CONMT. PET(C) NO.69	9/2018 IN C.A. NO.6235/2017				
	CONMT. PET(C) NO.18	46/2017 IN C.A. NO.8529/2016	-			
3.1.	Date : 21-02-2018 These matters were called on for hearing today.					
р. Т.	HON'BLE MR	. JUSTICE MADAN B. LOKUR . JUSTICE KURIAN JOSEPH . JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA				
32. 22. 32.	For Petitioner(s)	Mr. P.S. Patwalia, Sr. Adv. Mr. Arun Bhardwaj, AAG Haryana Mr. B.K. Satija, AAG Mr. Ronak Karanpuria, Adv. Mr. Ashish Pandey, Adv. Ms. Gauraan Bhardwaj, Adv. Mr. Shrutanjaya Bhardwaj, Adv. Mr. Vishwa Pal Singh, AOR Mr. Archit Upadhyay, Adv.				
Sig Sig Sig Sig Me	nalure Not Vertiled Italy sign by EVAKY KOHLI	Shaju Francis, Adv. Mr. Brijesh Kumar, Adv.				
· Da 19; Re	6: 20 WW2.21 435 GUT BEON:	Dr. Rajeev Sharma, Adv.				
		Mr. Deepak Anand, AOR				
S.		27 - F				
برگر م						
		1	τ- 			
	_*	с 				
х.	• ·	, [,] , [,]	x x			

all a the short short of

1

\$2.0

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Huzefa Ahmadi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. C.U. Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ninad Laud, Adv.
Mr. Yashraj Deora, Adv.
Mr. Jayant Mohan, Adv.
Mr. Anjuman Tripathy, Adv.
Mr. Ivo D'Costa, Adv.
Mr. Ashwani Kumar, AOR
Mr. Ravinder Nain, Adv.
Mr. Jay Kumar Bhardwaj, Adv.

2

18

5

È

差

S.

1

Ř

15

Æ

÷.

1.5 (`

jæ.

÷.

13

4

法

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

Mr. Mayank Kshirsagar, Adv.

Special Leave to Appeal (C).....CC 8453/2017 has been filed by the State of Haryana challenging the judgment and order dated 29th June, 2016 passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana in M/s. G.D. Goenka Tourism Corporation Limited & Anr. V. State of Haryana and Others.

There are some other similar matters that are listed today on the same subject, that is, with regard to acquisition of the land of the respondents.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the State of Haryana that the matter is covered by the recent decision of a Bench of 3 learned Judges of this Court in the case of <u>Indore Development Authority</u> Vs. <u>Shailendra (Dead)</u> <u>Through Lrs. And Ors. [(2018) 2 SCALE 1].</u>

During the course of the submissions made by learned counsel for the State of Haryana, some learned senior counsel were present in Court and they requested to be

1.

heard in the matter since they had been engaged in some similar matters. They submitted that the decision in <u>Indore Development Authority</u> had unsettled a long standing statement of law and had very serious repercussions on land acquisition cases.

Acceding to their request, we heard some learned senior counsel led by Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, Sr. Adv. and we also heard learned counsel for the State of Haryana.

Mr. P.S. Patwalia, learned senior counsel who has been engaged to represent the State of Haryana expressed his personal difficulty in appearing in Court today and tomorrow. However, he did appear for a short while and requested that the matter may be taken up on some other day.

Acceding to his request, we list the matter on 7th March, 2018 as part-heard matter.

It was submitted by Mr. Mukul Rohatgi, learned senior counsel and by other learned senior counsel that when a Bench of 3 learned Judges does not agree with the decision rendered by another Bench of 3 learned Judges, the appropriate course of action would be to refer the matter to a larger Bench. He submitted that one of the learned Judges in <u>Indore Development Authority</u> (supra) has expressed that view.

It was also submitted by Mr. Rohatgi that a Bench of 3 learned Judges cannot hold another decision rendered by a Bench of 3 learned Judges as *per incuriam*. He referred

• 1'

Ţ

5

3

\$),

 \mathbb{R}^{2}

 \geq

 \dot{z}

÷,

37

5

5

ŝ,

5.

3.

\$2

\$

츐

\$).

\$2

3,

\$

to some decisions but we need not go into them at the present moment.

Hearing is not concluded on the issue whether the matter should at all be referred to a larger Bench or not. However, we were informed by Mr. Rohatgi that some cases have already been decided on the basis of the judgment rendered in the case of <u>Indore Development</u> <u>Authority</u> (supra), without the matter being referred to a larger Bench.

We have also been informed by learned counsel appearing on both the sides that some similar matters are listed tomorrow as well and it is possible that in the next couple of days similar matters may be listed before various High Courts.

Taking all this into consideration, we are of the opinion that it would be appropriate if in the interim and pending a final decision on making a reference (if at all) to a larger Bench, the High Courts be requested not to deal with any cases relating to the interpretation of 24 of the Right or concerning Section to Fair Transparency in Land Acquisition, Compensation and Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013. The Secretary General will urgently communicate this order to the Registrar General of every High Court so that our request is complied with.

Insofar as cases pending in this Court are concerned, we request the concerned. Benches dealing with similar

.:

je.

淒

3

12

ie.

3

恣

3

35

15

÷.

j.

3

1

à.

N.S.

matters to defer the hearing until a decision is rendered one way or the other on the issue whether the matter should be referred to larger Bench or not. Apart from anything else, deferring the consideration would avoid inconvenience to the litigating parties, whether it is the State or individuals.

Delay condoned in SLPs.

í

-1

-1

Issue notice on SLPs returnable on 7^{th} March, 2018.

(SANJAY KUMAR-I) AR-CUM-PS

Dasti.

27. 27.

2. 2.

27 27

1. 1.

97. 197

(KAILASH CHANDER) COURT MASTER

5

, 'é'

ب ب ب ب ب ب

ج ب ب ب ب