

AWARD NO. 1174

Name of the village: Garhi Jaria Marian.
 Nature of acquisition: Permanent.
 Purpose of acquisition: Execution of the Interim General Plan for Greater Delhi.

Land measuring 154.50 acres as described by field numbers given in notification No.F.15(84)/57-LSG, dated 3.9.1957, issued under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 and situated in village Garhi Jaria Marian was notified for acquisition. This notification was issued under the authority of the Chief Commissioner of Delhi for a public purpose, namely, for the Execution of the Interim General Plan for the Greater Delhi. Due publicity was given to this notification as required by law and objections against the proposed acquisition received under section 5A were duly considered by the Local Government and a declaration under section 6 of the ibid Act was issued vide notification No.F.15(7)/61-LSG(1), dated 15.2.1961 in respect of 475 bighas 13 biswas for the same purpose. Due publicity was given to this notification also. Notices under sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 were issued to all the persons interested in the land under acquisition inviting claims for compensation. The claims filed by the persons interested are separately discussed under the heading "COMPENSATION CLAIMS".

TRUE AREA:

The land was measured on the spot by the land acquisition field staff in conjunction with a representative of the Requiring Department. On measurement the true and correct area was found as follows:-

<u>Field Nos.</u>	<u>Area</u> Big.	<u>Bis.</u>	<u>Kind of soil.</u>
14	3	0	Chahi
15	2	15	Rosli
151/16	2	3	Chahi

152/16	4	14	Chahi
17	13	14	Rosli
18	1	9	Rosli
159/19	0	18	Rosli
160/19	0	16	Rosli
153/20-21	4	16	Chahi
154/21	5	5	Chahi
22	2	14	Ghairmumkin
161/24	1	4	Rosli
23	2	10	Ghairmumkin
162/24	1	3	Rosli
163/24	1	3	Rosli
25	2	5	Ghairmumkin
26	5	13	Rosli
27	2	11	Ghairmumkin
28	2	15	Chahi
29	3	7	Chahi
30	3	0	Rosli
31	0	11	Ghairmumkin
32	5	14	Chahi
33	9	17	Chahi
34	5	10	Chahi
164/35	2	6	Rosli
165/35	9	8	Ghairmumkin
166/35	1	10	Ghairmumkin
36	0	18	Rosli
37	8	3	Rosli
167/38/1	50	10	Ghairmumkin (41 bi/ Rosli (8 big. 14 b Field
168/38	14	10	Banjar Qadim (1 G.Mumkin (13
169/38/1	11	14	Ghairmumkin
169/38/2	0	17	Ghairmumkin claims for
170/38/2/1	16	16	Ghairmumkin sections 9 and
170/38/2/2	2	1	Ghairmumkin

39	0	7	Rosli
40	9	14	Rosli
41	11	10	Chahi
42	7	6	Rosli
43	3	18	Rosli
44	0	7	Rosli
45	0	13	Rosli
46	5	8	Rosli
47	4	15	Rosli
48	0	15	Rosli
49	0	9	Rosli
50	4	15	Rosli
51	6	4	Rosli
171/52	3	12	Rosli
172/52	3	15	Rosli
173/53	2	0	Rosli
174/53	1	18	Rosli
54	0	7	Ghairmumkin
55	0	6	Ghairmumkin
56	0	12	Ghairmumkin
57	2	5	Rosli
58	2	10	Rosli
59	5	8	Rosli
60	0	14	Rosli
61	1	8	Rosli
175/62	0	14	Rosli
176/62	0	15	Rosli
63	1	14	Rosli
64	1	8	Rosli
65	4	11	Rosli (2) B. Qadi
66	0	8	Rosli written claims for
67 pt	3	0	Gps under sections 9 and
69	1	14	
73	4	13	

74	2	19	Rosli
75	2	6	Rosli
77	2	14	Rosli
78	0	15	Rosli
79	0	4	Ghairmumkin
82/1	3	6	Rosli
145	3	9	Rosli
147/2/2	17	6	Banjar Qadim
177/48	2	0	Rosli
196/184/150	16	17	B.Qadim (1 big. 14 bis) G.Mumkin (15 big. 7 bis)
197/184/150	8	18	B.Qadim (10 biswas) G.Mumkin (8 big. 8 bis)
198/184/150	4	11	Ghairmumkin
199/184/150	2	13	Ghairmumkin
200/184/150	7	1	"
185/150/1	20	2	"
186/150/2	33	7	"
187/150/1	33	7✓	"
188/150/1	7	2	"
189/150/2/3	1	11	"
190/150/3/1	0	10	"
Total:	475	3	

THE LAND IS CLASSED AS FOLLOWS:

Chahi	64 bighas	11 biswas
Rosli	145 bighas	11 biswas
Banjar Qadim	23 bighas	7 biswas
Ghairmumkin	241 bighas	14 biswas
Total:	475 bighas	3 biswas

The net difference of 10 biswas is due to actual measurement and comparison of area with the Settlement Field Book.

C O M P E N S A T I O N:

CLAIMS: The following gentlemen filed written claims for compensation in compliance with notices under sections 9 and 10 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

CONTD....5...

1) Shri Prabindra Lal Barua has filed a claim on behalf of Jagajoyti Vihara Sabha in respect of the land owned by the Sabha out of field No.147/2. The claimant has claimed compensation for the land owned by the Sabha while our record shows that the Sabha had purchased 10/542 share out of field No.147/2 and mutation No.391 is pending. He has raised an objection that the land should not be acquired at all. Such objections were already considered and rejected by the Local Government. The claimant is only ~~not~~ entitled to the compensation at the market value.

2) Sarvshri Mam Raj s/o Kalu, Natha s/o Sohlu, Hukam Singh s/o Jodha, Janghira s/o Bhagwan Sahai, Raghbir Singh s/o Mir Singh, Shiv Lal s/o Ram Sarup, Lalji s/o Bhikan, Kalu s/o Ghisa, Sarupa, Lamberdar s/o Popa have objected to the proposed acquisition and claimed Rs.55/- per sq. yard as compensation for the land but did not produce any evidence in support of their claim. The claim is exorbitant beyond description and so cannot be accepted in full. They are only entitled to the market value as determined by me in this award, under a separate heading.

3) Smt. Harinder Kapur Singh has claimed compensation for one acre of land at the rate of Rs.2 lacs per ~~are~~ but did not produce any evidence in support of her claim. The claim is fabulous and exorbitant beyond description. She is only entitled to the market value as determined by me in this award. She herself purchased this land for Rs.15000/- only on 30.4.1952 vide mutation No.250. She purchased 4 bighas 14 biswas from Bishan Sarup but actually the area as recorded in the revenue record is 2 bighas 1 biswas and so she can only claim compensation in respect of the remaining 2 bighas 13 biswas from Shri Bishan Sarup, the original Vendor.

4) Chander Singh s/o Gordhan claimed compensation at the rate of Rs.50/- to 60/- per sq. yard but did not produce any evidence in support of his claim. The claim is exorbitant

and fabulous beyond description and so cannot be accepted in full. He is only entitled to the market value as determined by me in this award.

5). Jalagi Devi Malhotra wd/o Late Shri Hukam Chand Malhotra has claimed compensation for 300 sq. yards of land out of field No.29 at the rate of Rs.30/- to 50/- per sq. yard but did not produce any evidence in support of her claim. She herself had purchased this land for Rs.1650/- on 24.7.1959. Since our date of notification in this case is 3.9.1957, hence this purchase after two years from the date of notification under section 4 is not relevant. The claim is fabulous and exorbitant beyond description. She will only get compensation at the market rate as determined by me in this award.

6) Krishan Lal Malhotra and Badri Nath Dhawan have filed a claim for 500 sq. yards of land out of field No.29 at the rate of Rs.30/- to 50/- per sq. yard. They themselves purchased this land on 31.3.1959 for Rs.,3000/- and even this price is not relevant as the claimants are only entitled to the market value prevailing on 3.9.1957 i.e on the date of notification under section 4. The claim is fabulous and exorbitant beyond description and has not been substantiated by any evidence. They will get compensation at the market rate as prevailing on 3.9.1957.

7) Chandi Ram s/o Ch.Maho Ram has objected to the proposed acquisition and did not put in any specific claim. The land measuring 1 bighas 11 biswas out of field No.189/150/2/3 is only under acquisition which belongs to the various parties and the claimant will also get compensat at the market rate as prevailing on 3.9.1957. The land cannot be released as already decided by the Government.

8) Sarvshri Chander Singh s/o Gordhan, Jaswant s/o Nathu Singh, Sarup Singh s/o Ajudhya Pershar have put in a claim for compensation for field No.26 measuring 5 bighas 15 biswas.

They have stated that they advanced Rs.600/- as earnest money to Kalu, Jagu, Kesari ss/o Ghisa, Gujjar of village Garhi Jaria Marian and the latter agreed to sell the land for Rs.19210/-. Since the claimants have not acquired ownership rights either by registered sale-deed or by mutation, hence they should first get ^{their} ownership rights established in a civil court. Compensation will not be paid to them till the ownership is established.

9) Shri Yash Pal Sabharwal has claimed compensation for 200 sq. yards of land out of field No.147 at the rate of Rs.55/- per sq. yard but did not produce any evidence in support of his claim. The claim is fabulous and exorbitant beyond description. He will not get the compensation till a mutation is sanctioned and his ownership is established.

10) Shri ^{mati} R.K. Bindar through Shri R.S. Bindra has claimed compensation for her share out of field No.164/29 at the rate of Rs.70/- per sq. yard but did not produce any evidence in support of her claim. The claim is exorbitant and fabulous beyond description and has not been substantiated by facts. She herself purchased this land at the rate of Rs.2082/- per bigha kham on 30.5.54. As the demand made by her is very high, so it cannot be accepted in full. She is only entitled to the compensation at the market value.

11) Shri A.S. Cheran has claimed compensation for field Nos. 167/38, 168/38. He has objection to the proposed acquisition and has demanded alternative plot, for building a house.

12) Shri K.P.S. Menon has claimed compensation for the land which stands in the name of his wife namely for field No. 169/38/1 and 170/38/2/1. He has demanded the market value as compensation. He himself purchased this land at the rate of Rs.2185/- per bigha kham on 31.5.1952 and 20.4.1952 vide mutation Nos.249 and 255.

13) Moti Ram, President, Social Convention, Amritpur, objected to the proposed acquisition and wants compensation in the form of fully developed plot and a house for a house.

This claim is also supported by Amar Chand s/o Chandra, Bhola s/o Churiya, Hoti Lal s/o Karen Singh, Chiranjii s/o Karen Singh, Rawala s/o Man Singh, Lachhman s/o Dalu and Manohari s/o Hulasir.

All these persons will get compensation for the land only when mutations in their names have been sanctioned. Some of them have built unauthorised houses only after the notification under

section 6 had been issued and some have as recently as within two months. They are at liberty to remove their Malba and those who own land under the houses will get compensation for the land only and not for the houses and Malba etc.

(4) M/s. Delhi Colonizers, Masjid Moth through Shri H.S. Tyagi, Advocate have claimed compensation for 59 bighas 15 biswas at the rate of Rs.35/- per sq. yard vide their written claim dated 15.5.1961 but they have not substantiated their claim by any evidence. The demand made by them is exorbitant beyond description and so it cannot be accepted in full in the absence of any quotation of sales. They are only entitled to the market value as prevailing on 3.9.1957. They have themselves purchased ~~the~~ ~~land~~ ~~for~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~claim~~ ~~compensation~~ ~~through~~ ~~mutation~~ ~~No.304~~ ~~through~~ ~~a~~ ~~registered~~ ~~sale~~ ~~deed~~ ~~dated~~ ~~13.5.1957~~ ~~at~~ ~~the~~ ~~rate~~ ~~of~~ ~~Rs.1840/-~~ ~~per~~ ~~bigha~~ ~~kham~~. Again through mutation No.305, in which the date of registration is 6.7.1957 at the rate of Rs.1224/- per bigha kham, again by mutation No.259 at the rate of Rs.2000/- per bigha. Through mutation No.302 in which the date of registration is 4.5.57 at the rate of Rs.1051/- per bigha kham. Again by mutation 263 at the rate of Rs.1065/- per bigha kham. This clearly shows that the date of notification under section 4, namely 3.9.1957 is very close to the dates on which the claimants purchased the land. This also proves that their claim is exorbitant beyond description. They again ^{cannot} deny the transactions by which they themselves purchased the land for which the compensation is demanded.

(5) Similarly Pt. Lila Ram has claimed compensation for 72 bighas 19 biswas at the rate of Rs.35/- per sq. yard.

the claim is exorbitant beyond description and has not been substantiated by any documentary evidence. He himself purchased the land for which the compensation is being claimed by him at the rate of Rs.1618/- per bigha vide mutation No.299 in which the date of registration is 30.5.56. Again at the rate of Rs.1176/- per bigha vide mutation No.308 in which the date of registration is 1.10.1956. Similarly on 11.10.1956 he purchased at the rate of Rs.1028/- per bigha vide mutation No.300. On 23.3.1957 he purchased the land at the rate of Rs.1755.73 nP per bigha kham vide mutation No.303. These transactions are very close to our date of notification under section 4, namely 3.9.57 in this case.

16 & 17) Shrimati Bhagwan Kaur, Sarvshri Hardyal Singh, Rajpal Singh, Dider Singh, Shrimati Satwant Kaur, Shrimati Ram Kaur, w/o Shri ~~Kapoor Singh~~ Santokh Singh, Hirdey Nandan, Moti Lal, Shrimati Vidya Wati, through Ch.Man Singh, Advocate, Hissar claimed compensation at the rate of Rs.50/- to 60/- per sq. yard plus other considerations like Rs.80,000/- as price of stones, bajri sand etc., Rs.2000/- per month from the date of notification under section 4 to the date of notification under section 6. and severance charges at 1/2th the amount of compensation claimed, the compensation claimed by them is very exorbitant and is not based on any valid reasons as I will discuss in this award. She along-with other co-sharers purchased this land for which so much compensation is being claimed at the rate of Rs.834/- per bigha kham vide mutation No.265 of which the date of registration is 12.1.1954. In evidence the claimants produced Nawab Din, Patwari of the circle and specially referred to mutation Nos.499 and 500 of village Zameradpur. In village Zameradpur through mutation No.499, 1 bigha 16 biswas of land was sold for Rs.16400/- on 16.4.1957 and through mutation No.500, 1 bigha 16 biswas for Rs.16400/-. Actually the date appears to be 16.9.1957 but through an over-writing in the mutation register it has been

changed to 2.9.1957. It all appears to be fabricated by the patwari or by somebody on his behalf. A separate enquiry will be made in this respect. This is irrelevant as the date of notification under section 4 in this case is 3.9.1957. Moreover these two transactions relate to village Zamaradpur. This piece of evidence is irrelevant as a large number of transactions in the village itself namely village Garhi Jaria Marian are available. Again it was brought through the statement of the patwari that in village Yakutpur 22 bighas of land was sold for Rs.1,80,000/- on 13.2.1957. Again this is irrelevant piece of evidence as a very large number of transactions in the land under acquisition are available, which clearly speak of its market value. It has been brought on the file that plot Nos. 97,96,98 and 110 measuring 140 sq. yards each was sold at the rate of Rs.12.25 nP, 13.25 nP, 13.25 nP and 12.25 nP ^{per sq. yd} on 19.10.57, 2.11.57, 12.10.1957 and 8.10.1957 respectively. Again this piece of evidence is quite irrelevant to the point in issue as the transactions are after the date of notification under section 4 in this case and the plots which are very small bear absolutely no relevancy to the land under acquisition. These are in other villages and the nature of description namely ~~plots~~ ^{number of} the ~~average~~ ^{plots} ~~piece~~ itself shows that these plots may be in a colony in which a lay-out plan could have been in existence. Revenue field numbers have ^{not} been quoted here.

Shri Ved Parkash, Registration Clerk has been produced as a witness and he has quoted the transactions ^{that} took place in Greater Kailash Colony No.I of the D.L.F. This piece of evidence bears absolutely no similarity with the land under acquisition as Greater Kailash Colony No.I is a fully developed colony and lay-out plan in this colony was sanctioned by the competent authority.

Shri Hari Karam Malik s/o Malik Bahadur Chand was produced as a witness who has stated that he was prepared to offer Rs.1,50,000/- for quarrying stones in July, 1957 but the owners

did not accept my offer. Against this statement of Mr.H.K.Malik is not correct as quarrying of stones or bajri in this area is prohibited. When quarrying is prohibited, the question of removal of stones does not arise and there was no sense in offering Rs.1,50,000/- for a purpose which could never be materialised. Moreover the claimants themselves purchased this land at the rate of Rs.834/- per bigha kham and it is unbelievable that it could have fetched Rs.1,50,000/- as rent for quarrying stones. Hence the claimants are not entitled to any price for stones etc. They are also not entitled to any severance charges as no severance has taken place and it is useless piece of land which the claimants could never build in its present state nor can they put it to any use and the income from it would have been nil. Again the claimants had claimed Rs.2000/- per month from the date of notification under section 4 to the date of notification under section 6. This is wholly unwarranted and the claimants were not deprived of the use of the land up to this date. The claimants are only entitled to the price of land as it existed on 3.9.1957, at a rate worked out by me under a separate heading 'market value'. The claimants themselves purchased some land vide mutation No.410 through a registered sale-deed dated 12.5.1958. They purchased 1/8th share of field No.187/150, measuring 29 bighas 3 biswas for Rs.13,000/- only and the average comes to Rs.446/- per bigha kham. Similarly 3/8th share of field No.186/150 measuring 12 bighas 17 biswas sold for Rs.16,000/- through a registered sale deed and mutation No. is 414. The average comes to Rs.1245/- per bigha kham. This transaction took place on 4.12.1957.

(18) Sarvshri Kishan Gopal, Nanak Chand, Rattan Lal, Badam, Khubi Ram, Nanga, Sarwan Kumar, Kirori, Papiya, Parbati, Bharat Singh, Mulakh Raj, Tilak Raj, Hardev, Parkash Devi, Bansil Lal have claimed compensation for thier plots which they have built up in an unauthorised manner over field No.147/2/2. Compensation will not be paid till the mutations are sanctioned in the name of each individual.

(19) Sarvshri Kalu s/o Ghisa, Girdhari s/o Chuni, Mam Raj s/o

Malu, Shiv Lal s/o Ram Sarup, Janghir s/o Enoja, Bharta s/o Asa, Mathu s/o Sohlu, Hukam Singh s/o Jodha, Janghira s/o Bhagwan Sahai, Lalji s/o Bhikan, Sarupa s/o Popa, Raghbir s/o Mir Singh, Ram Singh s/o Dhani, Bhoop Narain Singh s/o Prahlad Singh, Inder Singh s/o Prahlad, have demanded Rs. 55/- per sq. yard as compensation for the land but did not produce any evidence in support of their claim. The claim is exorbitant beyond description and they are only entitled to the market value as prevailing on 3.9.1957 which is separately discussed by me under a separate heading.

MARKET VALUE:

We have to assess the market value as prevailing on the date of notification under section 4 in this case namely 3.9.57. There are a large number of transactions that took place in similar lands as the land under acquisition as well as a large number of transactions that took place actually within the land under acquisition. The following figures show the average prices during the last 5 years preceding the date of notification under section 4:-

S.No.	Year	Area sold Big. Bis.	Consideration money	Average per bigha.
1.	1952-53	27 3	Rs. 27,600/-	Rs. 1016.57
2.	1953-54	124 10	Rs. 1,63,755/-	Rs. 1315.30
3.	1954-55	15 18	Rs. 8,000/-	Rs. 503.14
4.	1955-56	32 1	Rs. 24,500/-	Rs. 764.43
5.	1956-57	113 11	Rs. 1,12,195.50	Rs. 988.07

The following sale transactions took place within the land under acquisition very near the date of notification under section 4 in this case.

S.No.	Mutation No.	Date of Regn.	Area sold Big. Bis.	Consideration money.	
1.	287	1.8.57	7 3	Rs. 10,000/-	1399/-
2.	296	26.7.57	2 0	Rs. 25,000/- 2,500/-	1250/-
3.	302	4.5.57	39 11	Rs. 35,000/-	885/-
4.	303	29.3.57	6 11	Rs. 11,500/-	1756/-
5.	304	13.4.57	8 3	Rs. 15,000/-	1842/-

average per bigha

305	6.7.57	3	18	Rs. 4408/-	1130/-
411	19.7.57	34	6	Rs. 21,500/-	1254/-

All the above-mentioned transactions took place within two to five months preceding the date of notification under section 4 and are a much better guide to assess the market value of the land under acquisition on 3.9.1957.

There are transactions no-doubt within the land under acquisition which are valued at higher prices-for instance mutation No.249 in which field Nos.170/38/3 and 170/38/2/1, total measuring 18 bighas 1 biswas of land was sold for Rs.48,000/- on 20.4.1952 and through mutation No.255, field No.169/38/1, measuring 11 bighas 14 biswas of land was sold for Rs.20,000/- on 31.5.1952. The average per bigha in these two transactions comes to Rs.2185/-. Only these two instances cannot be taken as a guide to assess the market value when a large number of other transactions at lower rates are available. The claimants have led irrelevant evidence in respect of sales in other villages which cannot be relevant when a large number of transactions within the land under acquisition itself are available as quoted by me above.

I have inspected the land under acquisition. It is uneven, hilly and quite unfit for agricultural purposes. After fully development it can be used as building sites but at present there is no lay-out plan for this area and the land is quite undeveloped. Huge sums of money will have to be spent in its development and in making it fit for a residential colony. About 40% of the area will go under the roads, lanes and other community services. Cost of development will also be very large. There is no-doubt that the land just adjoining the metalled road i.e. Link Road leading from Lajpat Nagar to Kalkaji has some extra importance due to its situation on the road but without a lay-out plan nobody can be allowed to build the houses but still the land just adjoining the metalled road has extra importance as compared with the land in the interior. Hence taking into consideration a large number of transactions

the land ^{under} acquisition and the situation of the plots, I am of the firm view that the land under acquisition be divided into two blocks as under:-

<u>Block No.</u>	<u>Field Nos.</u>	<u>Area.</u>	
		<u>Big.</u>	<u>Bis.</u>
'A'	168/38	14	10 -
	169/38/1	11	14 -
	169/38/2	0	17 -
	170/38/2/1	16	16 -
	170/38/2/2	2	1 -
	186/150/2	33	7 -
	187/150/1	33	7 -
	190/150/3/1	0	10
Total:		113	2

'B' All the remaining area not included in Block 'A' measuring 362 bighas 1 biswa.

According to the importance of each block I assess the market value of block 'A' at Rs.2000/- per bigha kham and Rs.1500/- per bigha kham for block 'B'.

TREES: WELLS & OTHER STRUCTURES:

WELLS: There is a well in field No.31 which is assessed ^{Rs} Rs.2500/-

TREES: The list of trees is annexure 'A' attached with this award. The value of trees is assessed to Rs.273/- in all.

MAUFI:

In field No.145 there is x perpetual Maufidars namely Nathwa, Rana ss/o Sunehri, 1/3 share, Gurdial, Mawasi ss/o Badlu-2/3 share but maufi is only 1.12 and the 20 years capitalised value of it comes to Rs.22.40 which will be paid to the Maufidars according to their shares.

APPORTIONMENT:

In field No.147/2/2 many persons have made unauthorised constructions after the date of notification under section 6 and only during the last two months. The Naib-Tehsildar, Land Acquisition has made a report against them. He also warned these

persons. I have also warned them that they will get no compensation for unauthorised structures. Some of these persons have purchased small plots out of field No.147/2/2 but mutations have not been sanctioned so far. Compensation to these persons in respect of small plots will not^{be}/paid till mutation-s are sanctioned in their favour.. If the mutations are sanctioned on the basis of shares and no specific possession appears over a specific plot and the original owner disputes, then the compensation will be deposited with the District Judge.

Similarly compensation in respect of field No.168/38, 168/38/1 which Shri A.S.Charan claims to have purchased but there is no entry in the revenue record in his favour will not be paid till a satisfactory documentary evidence is produced.

Similarly compensation in respect of field No.26, measuring 5 bighas 13 biswas is disputed by Chandan with the original owners. It will only be paid if there is no dispute otherwise will be deposited with the District Judge.

Similarly compensation in respect of field No.167/38/1 is disputed vide application of Sarupa, Roopa dated 27.6.61, and if the compensation is still disputed, it will be deposited with the District Judge.

There is a stay order from the Punjab High Court on the writ-petition of Pt. Lila Ram not to dispossess him from his land. Consequently possession will not be taken of his land and compensation will also not be paid to him till the said stay order is vacated by the Punjab High Court.

15% FOR COMPULSORY ACQUISITION COST:

As provided by section 23, sub-section 2, 15% shall be paid on account of compulsory acquisition.

THE AWARD IS SUMMARISED AS UNDER:

S.No.	Block No.	Area	Rate per Bigha.	Amount of compensation
		Big. Bis.		
1.	'A'	113 2	Rs. 2000/-	Rs. 2,26,200.00
2.	'B'	362 1	Rs. 1500/-	Rs. 5,43,075.00
3.	Add price of a well			Rs. 2,500.00
4.	Add price of trees			Rs. 273.00
	TOTAL:			Rs. 7,72,048.00
5.	Add 15% for compulsory acquisition.			Rs. 1,15,807.20 nP
	TOTAL:			Rs. 8,87,855.20 nP
6.	Add Maufi			Rs. 22.40 nP
	GRAND TOTAL:			Rs. 8,87,877.60 nP

LAND REVENUE DEDUCTION:

The land under acquisition is assessed to Rs. 76.90 nP as land revenue which will be deducted from the Khalsa Rent Roll of the village with effect from the harvest in which the Department takes over possession.

Mahinder Singh 31/7/61
(MAHINDER SINGH)
LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR: DELHI.
30.7.1961

Submitted to the Collector, Delhi for information.

Mahinder Singh 31/7/61
(MAHINDER SINGH)
LAND ACQUISITION COLLECTOR: DELHI.
30.7.1961

Seen. Mus
COLLECTOR, DELHI.

31.7.61