

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[Arising out of SLP(C) No.10230/2023]

THE CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, STATE
INDUSTRIES PROMOTION CORPORATION OF
TAMIL NADU LTD.

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

D. VIJAYKUMAR & ORS.

RESPONDENT(S)

WITH

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) No.10233/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) No. 10234/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) Nos. 6363-6424/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) No. 10231/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) Nos. 10235-10236/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) Nos. 10239-10325/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) Nos. 10327-10328/2023]

CIVIL APPEAL NOS. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) Nos. 22770-22856/2025]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) No. _____ OF 2026]
[Diary No(s). 42231/2026]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. _____ OF 2026
[SLP(C) No. _____ OF 2026]
[Diary No(s). 42219/2026]

O R D E R

1. Delay condoned.

2. Leave granted.

3. The issue that arises for consideration in these cases is whether the respondent - landowners are entitled to be paid compensation for their acquired land in accordance with provision of the Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (in short, '2013 Act') with cut-off date of 01.01.2014 or as per the rate determined under the Tamil Nadu Acquisition of Land for Industrial Purposes Act, 1997 (in short, '1997 Act').

4. The State of Tamil Nadu accorded administrative approval to acquire 970 acres of land in favour of the State Industrial Corporation on 06.01.2009. Thereafter, a notification under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act was issued on 27.10.2009. This was followed by a public notice in Form 'B' on the same date. The State Government, after waiting for two years, published a notification in the Government Gazette on 13.12.2011. However, no award was passed. Meanwhile, writ petitions

were filed challenging certain provisions of the rules framed by the State Government under the 1997 Act. We are informed that interim protection was granted by the High Court in those writ petitions on different dates during the year 2012 to 2013.

5. Section 7 of the 1997 Act deals with "determination and payment of amount". Sub-section (1) provides that where any land is acquired by the State Government under this Act, compensation for such land shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of this section. Sub-section (6) of Section 7 has a material bearing, and it reads as follows:

"7(6) In determining the amount, the Collector shall be guided by the provisions contained in sections 23 and 24 and other relevant provisions of the of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 subject to modifications that-

(a) in the said section 23, the references to the date of publication of the notification under section 4, sub-section (1) and the time of publication of the declaration under section 6 of the said Act shall be construed as reference to the date of publication of notice under sub-section (20 and (1) respectively of section 3 of this Act; and

(b) in the said section 24, the references to the date of publication of notification under section 4, sub-section (1) and the date of publication of the declaration under section 6 of the said Act shall be construed as references to the date of publication of notice under sub-section (2) and (1) respectively of section 3 of this Act."

6. It may also be explained at this stage that barring Section 7, the 1997 Act does not describe any mechanism

for acquisition of land. It is obvious that the acquisition process, as mandated by Section 7(6) of the 1997 Act, was required to be completed in accordance with the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (in short, '1894 Act'). Even otherwise, the acquisition proceeding was to be concluded and the award made within a reasonable time.

7. The 1894 Act came to be repealed with the enforcement of the 2013 Act with effect from 01.01.2014. Section 24 of the 2013 Act too has some relevance, and it reads as follows:

"24. Land acquisition process under Act No. 1 of 1894 shall be deemed to have lapsed in certain cases.-(1) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, in any case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894,--

(a) where no award under section 11 of the said Land Acquisition Act has been made, then, all provisions of this Act relating to the determination of compensation shall apply; or

(b) where an award under said section 11 has been made, then such proceedings shall continue under the provisions of the said Land Acquisition Act, as if the said Act has not been repealed.

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in sub-section (1), in case of land acquisition proceedings initiated under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (1 of 1894), where an award under the said section 11 has been made five years or more prior to the commencement of this Act but the physical possession of the land has not been taken or the compensation has not been paid the said proceedings shall be deemed to have lapsed and the appropriate Government, if it so chooses, shall initiate the proceedings of such land acquisition afresh in accordance with the provisions of this Act:

Provided that where an award has been made and compensation in respect of a majority of land holdings has not been deposited in the account of the beneficiaries, then, all beneficiaries specified in the notification for acquisition under section 4 of the said Land Acquisition Act, shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

[Emphasis Supplied]

8. In the pending writ petitions, the question that arose for consideration was whether, in light of the new statutory regime which came into force w.e.f 01.01.2014, the respondent-landowners were entitled to be paid compensation for the acquired land in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act, with cut-off date of 01.01.2014 or the State of Tamil Nadu was competent to pass an award under the old regime.

9. It is an admitted fact that despite notification under Section 3(2) of the 1997 Act having been made in 2009, no award could be passed before 01.01.2014. It is true that interim orders came to be passed sometime in 2012-2013, but considerable time had lapsed between issuance of notification under Section 3 of the 1997 Act and such interim orders and no award had been made in the meantime. It is no longer *res integra* that after the 2013 Act came into force, the pending acquisition processes, where an award was yet to be passed, were required to be completed under Section 24(1)(a) of the 2013 Act and the award was required to be passed in such cases based on the market value of the land as on

01.01.2014. This is precisely what the High Court has done in the instant case.

10. We may hasten to add that in view of Section 7(6) of the 1997 Act (State Act), the expression 'Land Acquisition Act, 1894' shall be deemed to have been substituted by the 'Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013' as the emphasis made by State Legislation is on the 'Central Act'. There is no quarrel that at the time the award came to be passed, the Central Act in force governing the acquisition of land was the 2013 Act.

11. In this view of the matter, we find that the High Court has not committed any error in holding that the respondent-landowners are entitled to be paid compensation in accordance with the provisions of the 2013 Act based on the market value to be determined as on 01.01.2014.

12. For the reasons aforesaid, the appeals are dismissed. The appellants are directed to proceed in accordance with law.

13. However, if the State of Tamil Nadu finds that the acquisition will not be viable in public interest on account of the alleged excessive payment of compensation under the 2013 Act, they shall be at liberty to release

the subject land from acquisition and restore the same to the landowners free from all encumbrances. An appropriate decision in this regard shall be taken within eight weeks.

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

.....J.
(V. MOHANA)

NEW DELHI;
JULY 27, 2026

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).10230/2023

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 17-10-2022 in WP No.7550/2012 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras]

THE CHAIRMAN AND MANAGING DIRECTOR, STATE INDUSTRIES
PROMOTION CORPORATION OF TAMIL NADU LTD.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

D. VIJAYKUMAR & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 47391/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 47388/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.304276/2025 - MODIFICATION OF COURT ORDER, IA No. 66843/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

WITH

SLP(C) No. 10233/2023 (XII)

IA No. 42064/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 42065/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

SLP(C) No. 10234/2023 (XII)

IA No. 79222/2025 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS, IA No.44870/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 6363-6424/2023 (XII)

IA No. 48427/2025 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

SLP(C) No. 10231/2023 (XII)

IA No. 51565/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 66863/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

SLP(C) No. 10235-10236/2023 (XII)

IA No. 54199/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 63175/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

SLP(C) No. 10239-10325/2023 (XII)

IA No. 81630/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

SLP(C) No. 10327-10328/2023 (XII)

IA No. 75575/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 75577/2023 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.87274/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL

DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

SLP(C) No. 22770-22856/2025 (XII)

IA No. 95269/2025 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

Diary No(s). 42231/2026 (XII)

IA No. 205209/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING, IA No.205210/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 205211/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.205212/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Diary No(s). 42219/2026 (XII)

IA No. 204058/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING, IA No.204060/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT, IA No. 204068/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T., IA No.204064/2026 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 27-07-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

**CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA**

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR

**Dr. Abhishek Manu Singhvi, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Prashanto Chandra Sen, A.A.G.
Ms. Vrinda Bhandari, AOR
Ms. Vanshita Gupta, Adv.
Ms. Rajlakshmi Singh, Adv.**

Ms. Purnima Krishna, AOR

**For Respondent(s) :Mr. K. S. Mahadevan, Adv.
Ms. Swati Bansal, Adv.
Mr. R. Rangarajan, Adv.
Mr. Aravind Gopinathan, Adv.
Mr. R. Rajesh, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, AOR**

**Mr. V Balachandran, Adv.
Mr. M Rajasekar, Adv.
Mr. S Jeevanantham, Adv.
M/s. KSN & Co., AOR**

**Mr. Arvind Nayyar, Sr. Adv.
Mr. N. Doraikanan, Adv.
Mr. V. Balaji, Adv.
Mr. B. Dhananjay, Adv.**

Mr. Vinod K. Nair, Adv.
Mr. KV Dhanapalan, Adv.
Mr. C. Kannan, Adv.
Ms. Vidushi Aggarwal, Adv.
Mr. Rakesh K. Sharma, AOR
Mr. Siddharth Naidu, Adv.

Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR

Mr. B. Arvind Srevatsa, Adv.
Mrs. Aarthi Rajan, AOR
Mr. S. Santanam Swaminadhan, Adv.
Ms. Abhilasha Shrawat, Adv.
Mr. Kartik Malhotra, Adv.
Mr. Aman Rawat, Adv.

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

1. Delay condoned.
2. Leave granted.
3. The appeals are dismissed in terms of the signed order.
4. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ARJUN BISHT)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(signed order is placed on the file)

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DY. REGISTRAR