



2026 INSC 593

NON-REPORTABLE

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**Civil Appeal No. _____ / 2026
(Arising out of Special Leave Petition (Civil) No. _____ / 2026)
(Arising out of Diary No. 60376 / 2024)**

Gopala Agri Farms Pvt. Ltd. ...Appellant(s)

versus

The State of Haryana and others ...Respondent(s)

ORDER

SURYA KANT, CJI.

1. This matter was initially taken up on 10.01.2025, when notice was issued on I.A. No. 4478/2025, seeking condonation of delay of 846 days in filing the Special Leave Petition, as also on the Special Leave Petition.
2. Thereafter, when the petition was taken up on 21.02.2025, it was noticed that, as regards the claim on merits, this Court had already reserved judgement in ***Krishan Kumar v. State of Haryana and others***¹ and connected matters, which arise out of the same subject-acquisition. It

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by
SATISH KUMAR ADHAV
Date: 2026.05.29
16:37:45 IST
Reason: 

¹ Special Leave Petition (Civil) Nos. 9732-9734 of 2023 (renumbered as Civil Appeal Nos. 6427-6429/2025).

was, accordingly, observed that the question of delay in filing the Special Leave Petition would be separately considered, and orders were reserved.

3. The reportable judgement in **Krishan Kumar (supra)** came to be pronounced on 07.05.2025.² However, it transpired that the Registry did not list the instant matter for pronouncement of orders until, while scrutinising the relevant records, it was realised that formal directions disposing of the instant petition are still awaited.
4. The above circumstances have, thus, led to an inordinate delay in pronouncing the final order.
5. Delay in filing the Special Leave Petition is condoned. Leave granted.
6. Admittedly, the Appellant is the owner of acquired land situated in Village Fazalwas, Tehsil Manesar, District Gurugram, Haryana, and has preferred the instant appeal seeking further enhancement of compensation awarded by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh (**High Court**).
7. The acquisition was initiated through Notification dated 25.04.2008 issued under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (**LA Act**), followed by a Declaration dated 09.03.2009 under Section 6 thereof. Thereafter, the Land Acquisition Collector, by Award No. 20 dated 24.08.2009, assessed the market value of land in Village Fazalwas at Rs. 30,00,000 per acre.

² 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1043.

8. Aggrieved by the compensation so awarded, the Appellant approached the Reference Court seeking enhancement. The Reference Court, *vide* Award dated 15.11.2013, allowed the Reference Petitions and computed compensation at the rate of Rs. 62,14,421 lakhs per acre.
9. Still dissatisfied, the Appellant preferred Regular First Appeal No. 3389 of 2014 before the High Court. By the impugned common judgement dated 30.05.2022, the High Court **(i)** adopted the belting method, **(ii)** assessed the market value of lands abutting National Highway-8 up to a depth of five acres at Rs.1,21,00,000 per acre, and **(iii)** maintained the Reference Court's determination for the remaining lands situated beyond that depth.
10. The Appellant has thus preferred the present appeal seeking further enhancement over and above the compensation determined by the High Court.
11. The controversy is no longer *res integra*. In ***Krishan Kumar (supra)***, a two-Judge Bench of this Court, including one of us (*Surya Kant, J., as he then was*) considered the correctness of the compensation awarded in respect of the acquired lands situated in Villages Kukrola and Fazalwas under the same acquisition. So far as Village Fazalwas is concerned, this Court declined further enhancement and dismissed the appeals preferred by the landowners. The appeals preferred for reduction in compensation by the State of Haryana/HSIIDC were also dismissed on merits. The instant appeal is, therefore, squarely covered against the appellant by the decision in ***Krishan Kumar (supra)***.

- 12. Consequently, the Civil Appeal is dismissed in terms of the judgement dated 07.05.2025 in **Krishan Kumar (supra)**. The impugned judgement of the High Court dated 30.05.2022, insofar as it pertains to the Appellant, stands affirmed. The Appellant shall be entitled to compensation as determined by the High Court, together with all statutory benefits admissible under the LA Act, including solatium and interest, in accordance with law and subject to adjustment of any amount already paid, deposited or withdrawn.

- 13. The Respondent-Authorities shall forthwith, and in any case within eight weeks from today, deposit before the Reference Court the balance amount, if any, payable to the appellant in terms of the High Court judgement as affirmed by this Court. In case any amount already stands deposited but remains undisbursed, the Reference Court shall facilitate its release to the appellant without avoidable delay, subject to due verification and in accordance with law.

- 14. Pending interlocutory applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

- 15. Ordered accordingly.

.....CJI
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(NONGMEIKAPAM KOTISWAR SINGH)

**NEW DELHI;
MAY 29, 2026**