



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS**

WEB COPY

RESERVED ON : 20.11.2025

PRONOUNCED ON : 13.03.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE A.D.MARIA CLETE**

A.S. Nos. 440 to 446 of 2019

and

C.M.P. No.4081 of 2021

Mrs.Sudharani,

W/o.late.Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

Chairman-cum-Managing Director,

M/s.Essarar Foundation Private Limited,

28/19, Ramachandran Street,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellant in A.S.No.440 of 2019

Mrs.K.Sulochana,

W/o.Mr.K.Lakshmana dass,

Represented by her register


Power of Attorney namely Mrs.Sudharani,

residing at No.3A, Periyar Road,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellant in A.S.Nos.441 & 442 of 2019

1/22



WEB COPY

1. Mrs. S. Sudharani,

W/o. late. Sri. S. H. K. Ranga Rao,

No. 3A, Periyar Road,

T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

2. Mr. S. Rohidatta (Minor),

S/o. late Sri. S. H. K. Ranga Rao,

No. 3A, Periyar Road,

T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

3. Mr. S. Aswindatta (Minor)

S/o. late Sri. S. H. K. Ranga Rao,

No. 3A, Periyar Road,

T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

4. Minor S. Hemanathdatta,

Sri. S. H. K. Ranga Rao,

Minors Represented by his natural guardian and mother

namely Mrs. Sudharani,

No. 3A, Periyar Road,

T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellants in A.S.No.443 of 2019

1. Mrs. S. Sudharani,

W/o. late. Sri. S. H. K. Ranga Rao,

No. 3A, Periyar Road,

T. Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.



WEB COPY

2.Mr.S.Rohidatta (Minor),

S.o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

No.3A, Periyar Road,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

3.Mr.S.Aswindatta (Minor)

S/o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

No.3A, Periyar Road,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

4.Minor S.Hemanathdatta,

Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

Minors Represented by his natural guardian and mother

namely Mrs.Sudharani,

No.3A, Periyar Road,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellants in A.S. No. 444 of 2019

1.Mrs.S.Sudharani,

W/o.late.Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

No.3A, Periyar Road,


T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

2.Mr.S.Rohidatta (Minor),

S.o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,

No.3A, Periyar Road,

T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.



WEB COPY

3.Mr.S.Aswindatta (Minor)  
S/o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.


4.Minor S.Hemanathdatta,  
Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
Minors Represented by natural guardian and mother  
namely Mrs.Sudharani,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellants in A.S.No.445 of 2019

1.Mrs.K.Sulochana,  
W/o.Mr.K.Lakshmana dass,  
Represented by here registered  
Power of Attorney namely Mrs.Sudharani,  
W/o.late.Shri S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

2.Mrs.S.Sudharani,  
W/o.late.Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

4/22



WEB COPY

3.Mr.S.Rohidatta (Minor),  
S.o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.


4.Mr.S.Aswindatta (Minor)  
S/o.late Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

5.Minor S.Hemanathdatta,  
Sri.S.H.K.Ranga Rao,  
Minors Represented by his natural guardian and mother  
namely Mrs.Sudharani,  
No.3A, Periyar Road,  
T.Nagar, Chennai – 600 017.

...Appellants in A.S.No.446 of 2019

Vs.

1.The Special Tahsildar (L.Aq),  
Outer Ring Road Scheme, Phase II, Unit V,  
Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority,  
Chennai – 600 008 (Unit No.2)



2. The Member Secretary,


Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority,

Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.

...Respondents In All Cases

PRAYER in all A.S.: Appeal Suits filed under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, to set aside the Decrees passed in L.A.O.P. Nos.7, 1, 4, 6, 5, 3 & 2 of 2008 respectively on the file of II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur at Poonamallee and enhance the compensation award amount to the extent of further enhancement of quantum of compensation from Rs.5,000/- per cent awarded by the trial Court to Rs.19,000/- per cent with all statutory benefits and cost and thus render justice.

PRAYER in CMP: Petition filed under Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, to permit the petitioner to claim additional claim of Rs.8,500/- per cent and consequently direct the petitioner to pay the difference of court fee in the above appeal and also pass such further or other order in the nature and circumstance of the case thus render justice.



For Appellants: Mr. K.M. Venugopal in all cases.

WEB COPY

For Respondents: Mr. G. Nanmaran, Special Government Pleader (A.S.) for R1 in A.S. Nos. 440 , 441, 442 of 2019


Mr. M. Murali, Government Advocate for R1 in A.S. Nos. 443, 445 & 446 of 2019.

Mr. V. Venkateseshaiya, Government Advocate for R1 in A.S.No.444 of 2019

Mrs. P. Veena Suresh, Standing Counsel for R2 in all cases.

## COMMON JUDGMENT

These appeals are filed by the claimants under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. They challenge the common award dated 06.09.2017 passed by the II Additional District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur at Poonamallee, in L.A.O.P. Nos. 7, 1, 4, 6, 5, 3 & 2 of 2008, and seek higher compensation.



2. The table shows the AS Nos with corresponding LAOPs;

WEB COPY

Sl.No.	AS No.	LAOP No.	Award No.
1	440/2019	7/2008	5/2006
2	441/2019	1/2008	6/2006
3	442/2019	4/2008	5/2006
4	443/2019	6/2008	6/2006
5	444/2019	5/2008	1/2006
6	445/2019	3/2008	5/2006
7	446/2019	2/2008	5/2006

3. The lands acquired are situated in Thenambakkam & Vellacherry Village, Ambattur Taluk, Tiruvallur District, and are covered in the following L.A.O.Ps.: (i) L.A.O.P.No.2 of 2008—S.No.8/2A, extent 0.47.5 hectares; (ii) L.A.O.P.No.3 of 2008—S.Nos.8/1A, 8/1B, 8/1C, 8/1D, 8/1E, 8/1F, 8/1G1, 9/2B, 9/3A, 9/3B, 9/4A, 9/4B1, 9/4C1, 10/11B, 10/12B, 10/13, 10/14 and 11/4B, total extent 1.40.5 hectares; (iii) L.A.O.P.No.4 of 2008—S.Nos.8/3A, 8/4A, 8/5A, 9/5B, 9/6A1, 9/6B1 and 10/10B, total extent 1.40.5 hectares; (iv) L.A.O.P.No.6 of 2008—S.Nos.33/10B, 33/12A2, 33/12B2, 33/12C2, 34/4B, 34/5B, 35/3, 36/3A, 36/4A, 36/8A, 37/1A and 38/1A, total extent 1.93.5

8/22



hectares; and (v) L.A.O.P.No.7 of 2008—S.Nos.9/1B and 9/2A, extent 0.45.5

hectares; and (vi) L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008 - S.Nos.34/3B2, 35/1B, 35/2, 36/1, 36/2, 36/5A and 36/6A to an extent of 1.57.0 hectares; and (vii) L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008 - S.Nos.73/2, 73/3B, 74/5, 74/1A2 and 75/1C1 to an extent of 0.31.0 hectares at Vellacherry Village, Ambattur Taluk, Tiruvallur District. The acquisition is for the Outer Ring Road Project under G.O.Ms. No.385, Housing & Urban Development (UD-III-1), dated 16.10.1998, and the Government issued the Section 4(1) notification dated 08.10.2003 and 16.05.2003. The Land Acquisition Officer passed Award Nos.5, 6 & 1 of 2006 dated 15.02.2006 and 27.02.2006 by considering 442 sale transactions in respect of Thenambakkam lands and 27 sale transactions in respect of lands at Vellachery for the three-year period from 24.09.2000 to 23.09.2003, and fixed the market value at Rs.500/- per cent in respect of the lands at Thenambakkam & Rs.450/- per cent in respect of the lands at Vellachery. The landowners were not satisfied and therefore sought reference under Section 18 by filing the above L.A.O.P.s.

4. In the claim petitions, the claimants stated that the market value fixed at Rs.500/- per cent for the lands at Thenambakkam and Rs.450/- per cent for the lands at Vellachery is wrong. They claimed that even before the Section



4(1) notification, lands were sold at about Rs.4,00,000/- per acre. On that basis,

WEB COPY they sought enhancement up to Rs.50,000/- per cent.

5. The claim was opposed by the respondents and counter filed stating that the Claimant's allegation that the land acquired by the CMDA was under cultivation is false, as there was no cultivation on the said land. It was stated that there were no house sites, no approved layouts, and that the lands were left uncultivated. The lands were neither fit for cultivation nor for habitation, as they were low-lying due to excavation of soil for brick manufacturing. Hence, the Claimant's claim is without any legal basis. It was further submitted that, after the acquired lands were handed over, the Requisitioning Body had to spend lakhs of rupees for the formation of the Outer Ring Road Scheme for the benefit of the general public. Therefore, the compensation fixed by the Collector/Referring Officer was reasonable and justified.


6. The Trial Court framed the issue as to whether the claimants were entitled to enhancement of compensation and, if so, what amount ought to be fixed.

10/22



**WEB COPY** 7. Before the Reference Court in L.A.O.P.Nos.7, 4, 6, 3 & 2 of 2008, PW1 and DW1 were examined. On the side of the claimants, Ex.C1 (General Power of Attorney dated 29.11.2001), Ex.C2 (Resolution dated 01.11.2010), Ex.C3 (common award in L.A.O.P. No.280 of 2008 and batch dated 23.03.2011), Ex.C4 (Lok Adalat Award in Case No.243 of 2014 in L.A.O.P. No.91 of 2008 dated 18.10.2014), Ex.C5 (common award in L.A.O.P. No.329 of 2008 and batch dated 29.04.2011), and Ex.C6 (registered sale deed dated 22.04.2002) were marked and on the side of the respondents, Ex.D1 (sale deed dated 13.06.2002) and Ex.D2 (copy of the award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer) were marked.

8. In L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008, PW1 and DW1 were examined and marked Ex.C.1,( General power of attorney dated 29.11.2001), Ex.C2, (Common award in L.A.O.P.No.280 of 2008 & batch dated 23.03.2011), Ex.C.3,( Lok adalat award passed regarding Palavedu village), Ex.C.4, (Lok adalat award passed regarding Mittanamalli village), Ex.C.5,( copy of the registered sale deed dated 25.07.2001), Ex.C.6, (copy of the registered sale deed dated 12.09.2001), Ex.C.7, (copy of the registered sale deed dated 22.04.2002) and Ex.C.8, (copy of the registered sale deed dated 12.09.2003) and on the side of the respondents,



WEB COPY

Ex.D.1,( Copy of the sale deed dated 13.06.2002) and Ex.D2 (Copy of the award passed by the Land Acquisition Officer).

9. In L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008, PW1 and DW1 were examined and marked Ex.C1(Common award in L.A.O.P.No.280 of 2008 & batch dated 23.03.2011), Ex.C.2,( Award in Lok Adalat case No.243 of 2014 in L.A.O.P.No.91 of 2008 dated 18.10.2014, Ex.C.3, (Common award passed in L.A.O.P.No.329 of 2008 & batch dated 29.04.2011) and Ex.C.4,( copy of the registered sale deed dated 22.04.2002) and on the side of the respondents were marked. Ex.D.1, (Copy of the sale deed dated 13.06.2002) and Ex.D2, (Copy of the award dated 15.02.2006 passed by the Land Acquisition Officer).

10. The Reference Court considered Ex.C1 (in L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008), wherein compensation at Rs.16,500/- per cent was fixed for lands in Morai Village in L.A.O.P. No.280 of 2008 and batch dated 23.03.2011; Ex.C2 (in L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008), being the Lok Adalat Award dated 18.10.2014 in L.A.O.P. No.91 of 2008, where compensation at Rs.20,000/- per cent was fixed; and Ex.C4 (in L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008), in which the sale consideration worked out to Rs.13,952/- per cent. The Reference Court held that these instances pertained to villages situated closer to Avadi and, therefore, could not be treated



as comparable to the claimants' lands in Thenambakkam and Vellachery. The

WEB COPY

Court further observed that the claimants had not produced any revenue records to substantiate that the lands were wet lands, nor any material to establish their potentiality, and no sketch was filed to show proximity to the National Highways. However, taking note that the acquired lands fell within the jurisdiction of the CMDA, and that sale instances within a radius of 1.6 kilometres from the claimants' lands ought to be considered, the Reference Court enhanced the compensation to Rs.5,000/- per cent in all the cases, together with the usual statutory benefits. Aggrieved by the said awards, the present appeals have been filed.


11. The learned counsel for the claimants contend that the very purpose of acquisition, namely the Outer Ring Road Scheme, demonstrates that the lands are in close proximity to the Chennai limits and enjoy good connectivity and amenities. According to them, the development potential of the acquired lands is self-evident, particularly since the lands fall within the jurisdiction of the CMDA. They further submit that the Reference Court erroneously ignored the documents produced by the claimants. The claimants place reliance on the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **AIR 2006 SC 447** (*Union of India v. Harinder Pal Singh*) & others, **(2013) 16 SCC 392** (*Himmat Singh &*



*Others v. State of Madhya Pradesh & another*), and **2012 (3) CTC 396**

**WEB COPY** (*Mehrawal Khewaji Trust (Registered) Faridkot & another v. State of Punjab*

*and others*). They argue that even if the lands are situated in different villages, they may be treated as a single unit for the purpose of valuation, and the highest market value prevailing in such unit can be adopted. In the present case, Morai and Thenambakkam are abutting villages, and therefore comparable instances from Morai ought not to have been rejected. They consequently seek further enhancement of compensation from Rs.5,000/- per cent to Rs.19,000/- per cent. In support, they rely on Ex.C4 (in L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008) dated 22.04.2002, relating to lands in Morai (Maduraveerapuram), wherein the market value worked out to Rs.13,952/- per cent, whereas the notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was issued on 18.09.2003. On this basis, they submit that the Reference Court ought to have adopted at least Rs.16,500/- per cent (as reflected in Ex.C1 (in L.A.O.P.No.5 of 2008)) instead of fixing Rs.5,000/- per cent. According to the claimants, the above decisions support (i) adopting parity/one-unit valuation across abutting villages acquired for the same project (*Harinder Pal Singh's case cited supra*), and (ii) preferring the highest bona fide comparable sale while determining market value (*Mehrawal Khewaji Trust's case cited supra*).



WEB COPY

12. The learned counsel for the claimants further submits that in Award Nos.5 & 6 of 2006 dated 27.02.2006 relating to nearby villages, the market value was fixed at Rs.30,000/- and Rs.58,133/- per cent. It was submitted that in the common award dated 23.03.2011, compensation for Morai lands was fixed at Rs.16,500/- per cent, and that the LAO fixed the same Rs.500/- per cent for both Morai and Thenambakkam; therefore, the rate fixed for the lands at Morai can be adopted for Thenambakkam. They also relied on the Division Bench judgment of this Court in A.S.Nos.472 to 480 of 2012 dated 13.10.2015, where Rs.18,000/- per cent was fixed for the nearby village of Pammadukulam. Hence, it was prayed that this Court fix the compensation at Rs.16,500/- per cent with statutory benefits, solatium and interest.

13. The learned Government Advocate, on the other hand, produced guideline value and property valuation figures. They submit that for Thenambakkam village the guideline value was Rs.1,800/- per cent for the period from 01.08.2007 to 31.03.2012, and for Morai village it was Rs.26,136/- per cent for the same period. They argue that the Reference Court's fixation of Rs.5,000/- per cent for Thenambakkam and Vellacherry do not require interference and seek dismissal of the appeals.



14. Points for consideration:

- WEB 1. Whether the amount of compensation fixed by the Reference Court is correct?
2. Whether the claimants are entitled to enhancement of compensation, and if so, to what extent including statutory benefits and interests?

15. Point Nos. (1) and (2):

The acquisition in these appeals relates to the Outer Ring Road Scheme. The Land Acquisition Officer determined the market value at Rs. 500 per cent (Rs. 1,235 per are), mainly relying on a data sale, and rejected the higher claim for lack of supporting sale evidence.

16. The Reference Court enhanced the market value to Rs.5,000/- per cent. The appeals, however, consistently contend that this fixation is unsupported by any identified exemplar sale deed or a reasoned assessment of comparability, adjustments for time-gap, or applicable deductions. In determining compensation under Section 23 of the Act, the Court must specify the exemplar(s) relied upon and set out the steps by which the market value is arrived at; a bare round-figure fixation, without a supporting analytical chain, cannot be sustained.

16/22



WEB COPY

17. On the claimants' side, for Thenambakkam, reliance is placed on a series of sale exemplars (Exs. C5 to C8), culminating in Ex. C8 (in L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008) dated 12.09.2003, which is said to disclose a rate of Rs. 16,530/- per cent. The appellants further contend that lands in neighbouring villages within the same belt should not be valued differently merely because of village boundaries, invoking the "single unit" principle in ***Harinder Pal Singh's case (cited supra)*** and the rule that fixation should be guided by the best bona fide exemplar in ***Mehrawal Khewaji Trust's case (cited supra)***.

18. For Vellachery, the grounds raise the same core objection—namely, that the market value was fixed at Rs. 5,000/- per cent without being anchored to any specific exemplar document. They assert that the acquired lands lie in Vellachery Village, Villivakkam Panchayat, Ambattur Taluk, within the same Outer Ring Road corridor, and that a comparable belt valuation should therefore be adopted. The Vellachery grounds also refer to the Morai exemplars and contend that a higher belt rate—including the rate reflected in Ex. C8(in L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008) ought to guide the fixation.



WEB COPY 19.

Given that the acquisition is for the same public purpose and forms part of the same Outer Ring Road corridor, the plea to treat the area as a single unit or belt for valuation deserves acceptance in principle, subject to the usual safeguards of comparability. Once the single-unit approach is adopted, the next step is to identify the best bona fide exemplar closest in point of time and then make the requisite adjustments.

20. Among the exemplars relied upon, Ex. C8 (in L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008) dated 12.09.2003, reflecting Rs. 16,530/- per cent, is projected as the highest and most time-proximate indicator. It is therefore appropriate to treat Ex. C8 (in L.A.O.P.No.1 of 2008) as the benchmark for the belt, rather than sustain the unsupported round-figure fixation of Rs. 5,000/- per cent.

21. At the same time, an exemplar transaction cannot be applied mechanically. If the exemplar reflects marketability advantages over the acquired lands—such as in extent, shape, immediate usability, or other transactional factors—a deduction is necessary to arrive at a realistic market value for acquisition purposes. In the absence of a detailed comparative sketch or recorded findings permitting a precise quantified adjustment, a




reasonable moderate deduction of about 20% from the benchmark rate would be appropriate.

22. Applying a 20% deduction to the benchmark rate of Rs. 16,530/- per cent works out to approximately Rs. 13,224/- per cent, which may be rounded off to Rs. 13,500/- per cent for uniform application across the belt.

23. Accordingly, for the lands in Thenambakkam as well as Vellacherry, the market value is fixed at Rs. 13,500/- per cent, in substitution of the rate fixed by the Reference Court.

24. Once the market value is refixed, the claimants are entitled to statutory benefits—namely the additional amount, solatium, and interest—on the enhanced compensation, after giving due credit for any amounts already paid or deposited.



WEB COPY

25. In the result, the compensation awarded by the Reference Court is enhanced from Rs.5000/- per cent to Rs.13,500/- per cent. The claimants shall be entitled to the enhanced compensation of Rs.13,500/- together with all statutory benefits, namely solatium and additional amount and interest as per Sections 23(1A), 23(2) and 28 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. The appellant-claimant shall pay the requisite court fee on the enhanced compensation amount, if any deficit remains, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this judgment. Thus the appeals are ordered. There shall be no order as to costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition, if any, is closed.


**13.03.2026**

*mfa*

Index: Yes / No

Speaking Order / Non-speaking Order

Neutral Citation: Yes / No




WEB COPY

To

1. The II Additional District and Sessions Judge,  
Tiruvallur at Poonamallee.

2. The Special Tahsildar (L.Aq),  
Outer Ring Road Scheme, Phase II, Unit V,  
Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority,  
Chennai – 600 008 (Unit No.2)

3. The Member Secretary,  
Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority,  
Egmore, Chennai – 600 008.



WEB COPY



**DR. A.D. MARIA CLETE, J**

*mfa*

Pre-delivery Judgement made  
in  
A.S. Nos. 440 to 446 of 2019

13.03.2026

22/22