

G. Ramesan

Vs

State of Kerala and Another

Civil Appeal No. 2669 of 1997

(K. Ramaswamy, D. P. Wadhwa JJ)

31.03.1997

ORDER

1. Leave granted. We have heard learned counsel on both sides.
2. This appeal by special leave arises from the judgment of the Division Bench of the Kerala High Court, made on 22-1-1996 in LAA No. 414 of 1986.
3. Notification under Section 3(1) of the Kerala Land Acquisition Act, 1960 was published on 26-3-1976, acquiring 17 ares of land in Thampanoor which is part of the Trivandrum city, for construction of the Kerala Road Transport Corporation Depot. One are is equivalent to 2.47 cents. Possession was taken on 6-8-1976. The award was made on the same date and the sum of Rs. 8250 per cent was determined by the Land Acquisition Officer. On reference, under Section 18, the civil court by award and decree dated 21-7-1986 enhanced the compensation to Rs. 25,000 per cent. On appeal, the learned Judges made two categories of land. The first category consisted of 9.54 ares abutting the road, and another 7.60 ares interior to the lands covered by the first category, which is low-lying area below one metre to the first category land. Consequently, they determined the compensation at the rate of Rs. 61,750 per are for the lands abutting the main road and Rs. 43,035 per are for the low-lying lands. To that extent, the learned Judges reversed the decree and award of the reference court. As against the reversal in respect of the low-lying land this appeal has come to be filed.
4. Shri T.L.V. Iyer, learned Senior Counsel for the appellant, contends that the distinction made by the Division Bench between two belts of land is not correct in law. The belting procedure adopted by this Court relates only to large extent of lands. But the land in question being of a small extent and situated in the heart of the town, the belting principle is not valid in law. We find no force in the contention. It is settled legal position that depending upon the nature of the land and the location thereof, the belting procedure could be adopted on the principle that no willing buyer in an open market would prepare to purchase the lands abutting the road and the lands beneath the road being a low-lying area at the same rate. Under these circumstances, the Court sitting in the armchair of a willing purchaser would always order itself the above question and determine the proper and correct market value. The learned Judges, therefore, rightly have adopted the belting system in determining the compensation for the reason that no willing prudent buyer in the open market would offer the same rate for two types of lands.
5. Shri Iyer contends that at best the expenses to be incurred for filling up of one metre depth of the area is required to be deducted for determination of the compensation on a par with the lands abutting the main road. Prima facie the argument is attractive. When we asked the learned counsel

whether any evidence has been adduced in support thereof, very fairly, he has stated that no evidence has been adduced and, therefore, he requested to remit the matter to the reference court for reconsideration. We find that it is not possible to accept the contention. The learned Judges being aware of the local situation obviously were not inclined to grant the same compensation to the land lying in depth of one metre below the levelled-up land, as granted for with the land already developed. Under these circumstances, what requires to be considered is whether the High Court has committed any error of principle of law warranting interference. The question is one of appreciation of evidence taking the factual situation into consideration. The learned Judges, therefore, have not committed any error of principle of law warranting interference.

6. The appeal is accordingly dismissed. No costs.