

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). 10156/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 26-05-2025 in AUS37AACA No. 446/2022 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad]

BHARTIYA RASHTRIYA RAJMARG PRADHIKARAN

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

BHAIYARAM

Respondent(s)

([FOR FURTHER HEARING / CLARIFICATION]
IA No. 71484/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.)

Date : 09-10-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Mayank Grover, Adv.
Ms. Pratibha Vyas, Adv.
Mr. Kartikeya Singh, AOR

For Respondent(s) :

Mr. Ajay Veer Singh, Adv.
Mr. Shubham Singh, Adv.
Ms. Pratiksha Jain, Adv.
Mr. Udayram, Adv.
Ms. Divya Garg, Adv.
Mr. Akash Pratap Singh, Adv.
Mr. Nishant Singh- 3229, AOR

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

1. This matter was listed today for seeking some clarification.

2. Earlier, after hearing learned counsel for the parties on 8th September, 2026, judgment was reserved. And while examining the records it was noticed that in the Notification issued under Section 3A(3) of the National Highways Act, 1956 (published on 3rd June, 2005), there was no description of the nature/category of the land. Whereas, in the Notification dated 27th April, 2006 issued under Section 3D of the Act (appended with the petition) nature/category of the subject land is described as Residential/Commercial.

3. During the course of the hearing today, we put it to Mr. Mayank Grover, learned counsel for the petitioner about this discrepancy. However, he submits that what is material for computing market value of the acquired land is its categorization in the Notification under Section 3A(3). This Court further queried learned counsel for the petitioner that since the notification under Section 3D was issued within a year of the Notification under Section 3A(3) as to what were the major changes or development that had come into being in the interregnum. Learned counsel was not able to clarify this position.

4. Even otherwise, we find that all the authorities have concluded against the petitioner and the total compensation payable would only be in the range of

Rs.1,60,000/- (Rupees one lakh sixty thousand) for the land, apart from super structure.

5. Considering the overall facts and circumstances, we are not inclined to exercise our jurisdiction under Article 136 of the Constitution of India. The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

6. Pending application shall stand disposed of.

**(ANITA MALHOTRA)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**(NIKITA SINGH)
COURT MASTER**