

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO(s). _____ OF 2026
(Arising out of SLP(C) No.10747/2020)

M.P HOUSING BOARD

APPELLANT(S)

VERSUS

RAM KRISHNA (DEAD) THR. LRS. & ORS. RESPONDENT(S)

ORDER

1. Leave granted.

2. The appellant in First Appeal No. 495 of 2020 (First Appeal No. 43 of 2013 registered at Jabalpur) before the High Court of Madhya Pradesh is the appellant.

3. The matter arises under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894. The appellant filed the First Appeal, which was registered before the Jabalpur Bench as First Appeal No. 43 of 2013. The learned Judge heard the matter while presiding as a Judge of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at the Jabalpur Bench. The judgment was pronounced when the learned Judge was presiding over a Court at the Indore Bench.

4. Learned senior counsel takes preliminary objection, which, according to him, goes to the very root of pronouncement of Judgment by the High Court in First Appeal No. 495 of 2020. He places

reliance on Chapter XVII Rule 6 of the High Court of Madhya Pradesh Rules, 2008, in vogue which reads as under:

"6. (1) Where a Judge sitting singly has heard a case at Jabalpur, Indore or Gwalior but when the judgment/order is ready, he is not sitting there, the judgment/order shall be signed by such Judge and shall be transmitted in a sealed cover to the place where the case was heard with an authorization in favour of a Judge, sitting at that place, for pronouncement on his behalf. (2) The date of pronouncement of Judgment/order, in sub-rule 1 shall be the date of judgment/order."

5. It is argued that the appellant did not have notice of the pronouncement of the judgment on 22.05.2020. Secondly, the procedure followed does not conform to the extant procedure in the High Court of Madhya Pradesh. Further, in respect of the same acquisition, eight (8) more appeals are pending in the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at the Jabalpur Bench. He submits that, since the pronouncement is not in line with the rules of business of the High Court, the appellant is entitled to a relief in the challenge laid against the impugned judgment.

6. We have perused the record and have also heard the

learned counsel appearing for the respondent(s).

7. On the circumstances narrated by the appellant, and the objection taken in law on the method followed for pronouncing the judgment, no objection is stated by the learned Counsel appearing for the respondent(s). Therefore, we are of the view that the pronouncement does not conform to the procedure stipulated under the High Court of Madhya Pradesh Rules, 2008. Accordingly, the impugned judgment is set aside, and the matter is remitted to the High Court of Madhya Pradesh, at the Jabalpur Bench, to be tagged and heard along with the eight (8) pending appeals, which are as follows:

(i) FA- 384/2011 with FA- 369/2011

(ii) FA- 609/2012

(iii) FA-666/2012

(iv) FA-851/2012

(v) FA-625/2012

(vi) FA-48/2014

(vii) FA-711/2018.

8. The present civil appeal stands allowed, and matter remitted to the High Court for fresh disposal as indicated above.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.
[S.V.N. BHATTI]

.....J.
[AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH]

NEW DELHI;
SEPTEMBER 07, 2026.

ITEM NO.30

COURT NO.15

SECTION IV-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No. 10747/2020

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 22-05-2020 in FA No. 495/2020 passed by the High Court of Madhya Pradesh at Indore]

M.P HOUSING BOARD

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RAM KRISHNA (DEAD) THR. LRS. & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 89685/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT; IA No. 89684/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 07-09-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AUGUSTINE GEORGE MASIH

For Petitioner(s) Mr. R C Mishra, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Ilin Saraswat, Adv.
 Mr. Alok Kumar Dwivedi, Adv.
 Mr. Mahendra Kumar, Adv.
 Ms. Ananya Mishra, Adv.
 Dr. M.S. Verma, Adv.
 Mr. Pawan Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Avnish Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Santosh Kumar Pandey, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. A.K. Thakur, Adv.
 Mr. Raj Kishor Choudhary, AOR
 Mr. Shakeel Ahmed, Adv.
 Mr. Ranjan Kumar, Adv.
 Mr. Vikram Patralekh, Adv.
 Ms. Shalini Tripathi, Adv.
 Ms. Gulfeshan Javed, Adv.
 Mr. Himanshu Gupta, Adv.
 Mr. Amarish Chandra Tiwari, Adv.
 Mr. Vineet Jindal, Adv.
 Ms. Pratibha Singh, Adv.

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

1. Leave granted.
2. The civil appeal stands allowed in terms of the signed order which is placed on the file.
3. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(SNEHA DAS)
COURT MASTER (SH)

(NIDHI MATHUR)
COURT MASTER (NSH)