

In the Supreme Court of India  
Civil Appellate jurisdiction  
SLP ( CIVIL) No 9798-99 OF 2016

In the matter of:

Indore Development Authority ... Petitioners

Versus

Manohar Lal and others ... Respondents

**QUESTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION:**

1. In the absence of a procedure for payment of compensation to a beneficiary pursuant to an award (under Section 11 of the Act of 1894 by the Land Acquisition Collector), what should be the principles governing the procedure for payment, which on the one hand take care of the interests of the state, and on the other hand protect the interests of the beneficiary?
2. Since Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013, assumes that proceedings for acquisition have commenced prior to 01.01.2014, should the procedure for payment of compensation take its colour from the mode and manner of payment as provided under Section 31 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894?
3. Is it sufficient for the Land Acquisition Collector to offer payment to a beneficiary under the award, by merely informing him that an award has been rendered, and will that satisfy the requirement of payment under Section 24(2)?
4. Does the proviso to Section 24 of the Act of 2013 not assume that the acquisition has been completed, payment tendered and possession taken, before the condition stipulated in the proviso for the majority of the

beneficiaries not having deposited the compensation in their bank accounts, trigger the provisions of the Act of 2013 and entitle them only to compensation under the provisions of the Act?

5. Is it enough for the State to prepare a document for possession (panchnama) of the land tantamount to taking physical possession of the land and does such a procedure satisfy the requirement under Section 24(2) of the Act of 2013?
6. In the absence of a procedure for the manner and mode of taking physical possession by the state in the Act of 1894, what is the procedure the State should have adopted while taking possession of the land pursuant to rendering of an award?
7. Whether the proviso to Section 24 must be held to be a proviso with reference to Section 24(1)(b) and not section 24(2) of the Act of 2013?
8. Whether the period during which a stay order operating against the acquisition of land pursuant to an award even if excluded in computing the five year period under Section 24(2) absolves the acquisition authorities from the obligation of depositing the amount of awarded compensation for the beneficiaries with the reference court as provided for under Section 31 of the Act of 1894?
9. In the light of the above, whether the judgments rendered in *Indore Development Authority v Shailendra* 2018 (3) SCC 412, and *Delhi Metro Rail Corporation v Tarun Pal Singh* (2018) 14 SCC 161 reflect a true and correct interpretation of Section 24 of the Act of 2013?