



IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4623 OF 2021  
(Arising out of SLP (C)No. 12066 of 2021)  
(Arising out of SLP (C)CC No. 4865 of 2017)

CENTRAL GOVT. OF INDIA

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

RAJ DEVI ALIAS RAJ KUMARI & ANR.

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

K. M. JOSEPH, J.

Delay in filing the special leave petition is condoned.

Leave granted.

We have heard Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, learned Additional Solicitor General appearing for the appellant, and Mr. J.S.Thind, learned counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

By the impugned judgment, the High Court upheld order dated 11.11.2014 by which the objections filed by the appellant were disposed of by the Execution Court and the appellant was directed to make payment on or before 12.01.2015.

The dispute in question which arises for our consideration is whether interest is payable on solatium

from the date possession was taken from the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent. There is no doubt that physical possession was taken in this case on 16.06.1990. The contention of the appellant, however, is that this is a case where the principle which has been enunciated by this Court in *Gurpreet Singh v. Union of India* (2006) 8 SCC 457 would apply and interest on solatium could be granted only from the date of the judgment of this Court in *Sunder v. Union of India* (2001) 7 SCC 211 i.e. 19-09-2001.

We may notice the reasoning of the High Court, which is as follows:

"Mr. J. S. Thind, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No. 1-claimant-landowner submits that this Court while deciding the R.F.A. had granted the element of solatium and interest and the findings have been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. This fact is not disputed by the other side. He submits that the award granting solatium and interest being not part of the decree has already been upheld by the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 2.1.2014 passed in Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. 21784-21799 of 2013 (Central Govt. of India, Thru Defence Est. Versus Bakhta & another etc. etc.). In the other matters also, the land owners had assailed the findings of the Executing Court and the same have been set-aside by this Court vide order dated 21.2.2013 passed in Civil Revision No. 3160 of 2012 and other connected matters (Annexure P-10). This fact is also not disputed by the counsel for the petitioner.

In view of the aforementioned facts, I do not find any illegality and perversity in the order under challenge. No interference in the impugned order is called for."

Therefore, as already noticed, the question arises

whether in the facts of this case, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was entitled to interest from the date the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was deprived of physical possession or from the date of the judgment in *Sunder supra*.

Award was passed in this case on 12.06.1990. The relevant part reads:

"The land owners and the interested persons will be entitled to 30% solatium in consideration of compulsory nature of acquisition on the total price of land. In view of the amended proposition of section 23 of the act the land owners are also entitled an additional amount at the rate of 12% on the market value from the date of notification u/s 4 which will be paid later on after the approval of the appropriate Government under Section 11(iii) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and allotment of funds. The land owners are also entitled to get 12% additional amount on the remaining amount of compensation from the date of taking possession and an additional interest @ 9% per annum on the remaining amount in connection with possession till they get final payment."

It is not in dispute that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent along with others appealed the Award and in the judgment, the High Court granted relief to the appellants by enhancing the compensation and it is necessary to notice the relief portion which reads as follows:

"While adopting the reasoning given in Dr. Balbir Singh's case (*supra*) and in view of the reasons and circumstances stated herein above, the Regular First Appeals preferred by the claimants are partly accepted while those preferred by the Union of India are dismissed. Resultantly, the claimants would be entitled to get a sum of Rs.4,06,320.00 per acre with all the statutory benefits available to them, more particularly, under Sections 23(1-A), 23(2) and 28 of the Land Acquisition Act. However, there shall be no

order as to costs.”

There is no doubt that the said judgment has become final, the appeals and special leave petition being dismissed.

The decree was put in execution and the Execution Court has passed the order which is impugned by the appellant herein, by which the appellant is directed to pay interest on solatium from the date the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was deprived of her possession.

The High Court proceeded in this case on the basis that not only was solatium ordered in favour of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent but 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was also granted the benefit of interest on solatium.

The second plank on which the judgment of the High Court is supported is the order passed by this Court in the case of *Central Government of India v. Bakhta & Another etc.* (SLP (C)Nos. 21784-21799 of 2013).

The stand of the appellant is that this is a claim where the matter must be resolved with reference to the law enunciated in *Gurpreet Singh supra*. The relevant portion of the declaration is to be found in para 54 of the judgment:

54. One other question also was sought to be raised and answered by this Bench though not referred to it. Considering that the question arises in various cases pending in courts all over the country, we permitted the counsel to address us on that question. That question is whether in the light of the decision in *Sunder* (2001) 7 SCC 211, the awardee/deed-holder

would be entitled to claim interest on solatium in execution though it is not specifically granted by the decree. It is well settled that an execution court cannot go behind the decree. If, therefore, the claim for interest on solatium had been made and the same has been negatived either expressly or by necessary implication by the judgment or decree of the Reference Court or of the appellate court, the execution court will have necessarily to reject the claim for interest on solatium based on *Sunder* on the ground that the execution court cannot go behind the decree. But if the award of the Reference Court or that of the appellate court does not specifically refer to the question of interest on solatium or in cases where claim had not been made and rejected either expressly or impliedly by the Reference Court or the appellate court, and merely interest on compensation is awarded, then it would be open to the execution court to apply the ratio of *Sunder* and say that the compensation awarded includes solatium and in such an event interest on the amount could be directed to be deposited in execution. Otherwise, not. We also clarify that such interest on solatium can be claimed only in pending executions and not in closed executions and the execution court will be entitled to permit its recovery from the date of the judgment in *Sunder* (19-9-2001) and not for any prior period. We also clarify that this will not entail any reappropriation or fresh appropriation by the decree-holder. This we have indicated by way of clarification also in exercise of our power under Articles 141 and 142 of the Constitution of India with a view to avoid multiplicity of litigation on this question."

We have noticed the terms of the Award as also the judgment of the High Court in appeal carried by the respondents.

As far as the Award passed is concerned, it is clear that interest is not seen granted on solatium. What is granted is only solatium. Moving on to the judgment of the High Court in appeal carried by the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, therein

also, it is clear beyond the shadow of any doubt that the High Court has not granted interest on solatium. What is seen granted by the High Court is the benefit under Section 23(2) among other statutory benefits. We are unable to find reference to interest on solatium. Therefore, this would be a case which must be dealt with in terms of the declaration of law made in *Gurpreet Singh supra*.

Shri J. S. Thind, learned counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, would, however, try to persuade us to support the decision of the High Court by pointing out that as found by the High Court in the impugned judgment, Government of India failed in the special leave petition carried against the judgment of the High Court which also arose from execution proceedings in the case of *Central Government of India v. Bakhta & Another etc.* which also arose from the same Award.

We have perused the order which is relied on by the learned counsel for the respondent. It is true that the special leave petition carried by the appellant was dismissed. However, what is pertinent to note is what was the issue which was involved in the said case. In a batch of matters, the Executing Court in the said case had awarded interest on solatium from the date of the judgment in *Sunder supra*. It was this order which was upheld by the High Court by its judgment dated 25.01.2013. We may only notice

paragraph 6 of the said judgment:

“6. In view of the legal proposition enunciated in these authorities, Court of Reference/Executing Court was perfectly justified in allowing the interest on the solatium with effect from September 19<sup>th</sup>, 2001 in execution proceedings.”

It is this order which was the subject matter of the special leave petition before this Court which came to be dismissed. In other words, this was the case where the Executing Court had applied the principle in *Gurpreet Singh supra* and granted interest on solatium from the date of the judgment in *Sunder viz.*, 19-09-2001 in the execution proceeding. We are unable to comprehend as to how this judgment can come to the rescue of the respondent. We are, therefore, of the clear view that the appeal is to be allowed. Accordingly, we allow the appeal. Impugned order will stand set aside. The order which was impugned before the High Court will stand set aside and it is ordered that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent will be entitled to interest on solatium from the date of *Sunder (supra) viz.* 19-9-2001.

No orders as to costs.

....., J.  
[ K.M. JOSEPH ]

....., J.  
[ S. RAVINDRA BHAT ]

New Delhi;  
August 05, 2021.

ITEM NO.2 Court 12 (Video Conferencing) SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4623/2021

CENTRAL GOVT. OF INDIA

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

RAJ DEVI ALIAS RAJ KUMARI AND ANR.

RESPONDENT(S)

(IA No. 1/2017 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

Date : 05-08-2021 This appeal was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.M. JOSEPH  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. RAVINDRA BHAT

For Appellant(s)

Ms. Aishwarya Bhati, Ld. ASG  
Mr. A.K. Kohli, Adv.  
Ms. Ruchi Kohli, Adv.  
Ms. Saudamini Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Suhasini Sen, Adv.  
Mr. Siddhant Kohli, Adv.  
Mr. A. K. Sharma, AOR  
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Maroria, AOR

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Merusagar Samantaray, AOR

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

Delay in filing the special leave petition is condoned.

Leave granted.

The civil appeal is allowed in terms of the signed reportable order.

Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

(NIDHI AHUJA)  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(BEENA JOLLY)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)

(Signed reportable order is placed on the file.)